

6.29.14.

Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Dr. E. S. Patton.

Division

BS 2361 .J3 1900
Jacobus, Melancthon
Williams, 1855-1937.
A problem in New Testament
criticism

George P. Patton



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

A PROBLEM IN
NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM





A Problem in New Testament Criticism

The Stone Lectures for 1897-1898

BY

MELANCTHON WILLIAMS JACOBUS, D.D.

PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT EXEGESIS IN THE
HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY



NEW YORK
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS
1900

Copyright, 1900

BY CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

UNIVERSITY PRESS • JOHN WILSON
AND SON • CAMBRIDGE, U.S.A.

To the Memory

OF

MY REVERED INSTRUCTOR IN NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES

CASPAR WISTAR HODGE

WHO OPENED TO ME THE SCRIPTURES

PREFACE

THESE lectures do not profess to be an exhaustive study of their theme; they are simply what lectures must necessarily be — suggestions in the direction of further investigation and research.

They are reproduced substantially as they were delivered before the faculty and students at Princeton. The third lecture has been altered in a few phrases, in order to make its statements clearer; and the foot-notes throughout have been added simply by way of explanation and justification of the positions taken in the body of the text.

They are published now, as they were first given, with the hope that they may be helpful to those who are conscious of the problem considered in them and are ready for some way to its solution.

M. W. JACOBUS.

HARTFORD, *January*, 1900.

CONTENTS

LECTURE	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTORY	I
II. THE PRELIMINARY PROBLEM OF THE METHOD	27
III. THE PROBLEM OF THE PHILOSOPHY . .	73
IV. COMPARISON OF THE TEACHINGS OF JESUS AND PAUL	133
V. COMPARISON OF THE TEACHINGS OF JESUS AND PAUL	178
VI. THE DEVELOPMENT OF PAUL'S DOCTRINE OF CHRISTIAN UNITY	230

A Problem in New Testament Criticism

I

INTRODUCTORY

IT would seem that a course of lectures, to be of service to the thinking Church of to-day, might be better chosen in almost any other field than that of New Testament Criticism. There are so many problems in the other departments of Biblical study, — problems which seem so to affect the faith of to-day; while the problems of the New Testament appear to have been so disposed of, the old sceptical order yielding place to the acceptance of a historical and practically Apostolic Age Canon, that one might almost question the wisdom of using the time to discuss New Testament things.

Here, for instance, is the Old Testament, standing, as it does, the religious background for the Christian faith, with the documentation

of its historical narratives and the historicity of their documents, the dating of its psalms, the defining of the attitude of its prophets towards the law and the ceremonial institutions of the nation's religion, — in fact, with the whole question of the progress and the development of this religion in the critics' hands, involving all the large problems of internal evidence, and the yet larger problems of external evidence.

Here is the department of Historical Criticism, affecting us so vitally as to the heritage of doctrine which we have received, with its large question of the Catholic Church, and the part of that Church in the establishment of the New Testament Canon we possess, and its influence on the body of dogma which has come down to us from the early Church.

Here is the department of Systematic Theology, touching us so closely in our creedal beliefs, with its changes of view which are going on to-day, especially in our own country, — the changes which seem to be centering around the doctrines of inspiration and atonement, and with the outlook, just ahead of us,

of a yet possible further change at the point of the doctrine of the person of Christ.

Here is the department of Apologetics, holding so tight a grasp on philosophy and theology, and bringing them so necessarily before us, with its ever great problem of the defining of Christianity and the defending of the Christianity which it defines.

Here is Sociology, sending us so out into, not merely the practical life around us, but that practical life as it so practically affects the interests of God's Church to-day and the future of God's Kingdom in the world, with its groping after the very principles on which it is to build its work, its effort to know itself and understand its relation to the Church and the world, and the mass of living souls swept out into the darkness and death of the great cities.

Any of these would seem to mean more — much more for us to-day than the well-worn and apparently well-decided problems of New Testament work. The ebbing of the great tide of Tübingenism has left us with such a sense of gain in the historical and literary

criticism of the New Testament that we are tempted to believe there is little more to be discussed in this department, and that it is rather in other directions that we are to go for the vital problems of to-day.

I admit all this with perfect freedom. New Testament criticism may not be so much at sea as Old Testament criticism is said to be, at least at some of its points; it may not be in the swing of currents as historical criticism would seem to be; it may not be the centre of such storms as appear to be the coming, if not the present, fortune of systematics; it may not be in the midst of such rapids as apologetics, nor upon such a trackless waste of waters as sociology; but it is abroad upon the deep, steering its course, and there are reckonings for it to work out, — reckonings which may send it far adrift, if they be worked out wrongly, which perhaps have been hindering its course, because, so far, they have not been worked out aright. There are then present-day problems in New Testament criticism which mean much to the criticism itself, and, in proportion as this criticism has to do with

the heart and life of the religion of the Christ, mean much — very much to it.

There is, first of all, the Synoptic Problem, with its specific question of oral or documentary sources for the Gospel narrative and its general question of the existence and growth of an extra-canonical literature. We cannot lay aside the possibility of a documentary solution of this problem's specific question with the excuse that such a solution lies behind the documents we at present have, and is not possible of securing save through the assumption of an analytic criticism of the Gospels themselves. This is to ignore the fact that such analytic criticism is an acknowledged and accepted part of the higher critical method, and must be admitted as allowable in the case of the Gospels. Besides this, we have in Luke's prologue a hint at the literary state of things when his Gospel was composed, and this hint may lie as well in the direction of a documentary as an oral solution of the problem; while the discovery of such remains as the Oxyrrhyncus papyrus shows the possibility of at least one of the document sources

which has been considered to be critically necessary for the Gospels, and this source perhaps the most debated one, — the source which it is held consisted of a collection of the discourses of Christ. We cannot, on the other hand, dismiss as trivial the problem's general question; since it involves the matter of the pre-canonical growth of the literature which led up to the Gospels we have, and which is so unmistakably implied in this prologue of Luke's. This problem, with its question, may be solved rightly — in such a way as to give us a better, if not a perfect, understanding of the basis for such Gospel literature as we have, — or it may be solved wrongly, and New Testament criticism be left confused and uncertain of those things which it is its privilege, to some extent at least, to know, and its duty, as far as it knows them, to make clear.

There is the problem of the Fourth Gospel, with the question of its possible Johannine origin. To some it may seem that this problem has been practically settled by the successive admissions on the part of radical criticism, which throw its dating back, even in its

present form, to where we may say it is possible for it to have come from the Apostolic circle. But the contention of the critics is not so much concerning its date as concerning its contents, and the debate to-day is whether the profound spiritual thought of this Gospel can have come from the Galilean fisherman who was the Beloved Disciple, — whether his Asian life and work, his Ephesian surroundings and conditions can account for the metaphysical color which it has, or whether there is here a Gnosticism that throws it into an outer circle from the Apostles, or at least gives to only the simpler parts of its present form a Johannine source. This is not a problem to be lightly handled, as solving itself. It involves issues too significant to our faith. If it be solved aright, it will help us at points which are of large importance in our conception of Christianity; if it be solved wrongly, it will distort our views and leave us in confusion where we can poorly afford to have our views imperfect.

There is the nearly related problem of the Apocalypse, with its tangle of sources and its

consequent confusion of author. In the heat of the Tübingen criticism it stood accepted along with the four chief Epistles of Paul; but that was because Tübingen's historical preconception of the Apostolic conflict enabled it to see enough of polemics in the Book to make it of early date. This preconception has gone the way of its Hegelian basis, and a new philosophy has come in to make the critic keen for sources, and so the Apocalypse has come under the dissecting knife. We cannot be indifferent to the many difficulties which this Book presents to criticism, in how many ways it seemingly justifies a divisive treatment of its text, at how many points it shows apparent contact with extra-canonical literature, how its spirit seems to be in the channel of Jewish apocalyptic thinking, — how, in fact, its problem involves the whole question of the value of apocalyptic literature in the canonical Scriptures. Solve the problem of this Book rightly, and it will help us, not only to clear ideas here, but in the Antichrist passage of Paul's second letter to the Thessalonians, and in Christ's eschatological remarks as given in

Matthew and Mark. Solve it wrongly and it will keep these passages and this Book itself living riddles to us.

There is the problem of Second Peter, the one Book which Harnack will not receive into the strictly genuine canonical circle, with its difficulties of style and its unique place among the antilegomena of the patristic Church. We cannot close our eyes to its over-resemblance to the Epistle of Jude, nor to its under-resemblance to its companion Epistle of Peter; we cannot forget the lack of external evidence which makes it the latest attested book in the Canon; and we cannot fail to see how its criticism involves matters in the history of the Jewish State and the Christian Church which, to say the least, are puzzles. If this problem then be solved aright, we shall have light on some of the principles of interrelation of style among New Testament writings, on some of the methods of the patristic usage of New Testament Books, and on some of the facts of later Jewish and early Christian history which will help us with all the rest of the Canon. Let it be solved wrongly, and we must stand

in the darkness and be less successful with every effort we make to get to the light.

There is finally the problem of the Epistle to the Hebrews, with the question of its Pauline origin. In some respects this may be admitted to be a question of secondary importance. The Book stands accepted as from the Apostolic Age, whether Paul be its author or not. Its canonical rights are unquestioned. And yet in this problem are involved some questions as to the reliability of external evidence, especially when it disagrees with itself, and some questions as to just what constituted canonicity in the mind of the patristic Church. Let such a problem be solved aright and New Testament criticism will be in position to understand itself at some points where it is in doubt to-day, and be able to furnish help to other departments of Bible study which look to it naturally for this service.

A year or so ago there might have been said to be a problem of the Book of Acts. With some there is yet doubtless such a problem, involving the Book's integrity, in its present form, and its historical reliability as over

against the Epistles of Paul. But with such independent work as Ramsay and Blass have done — the one going, more or less of a sceptic, to study archæologically the lands of Paul's travels, and coming away convinced that the critic and not the Book was wrong; the other approaching the textual study of the Book as a pure philologist, and coming, through this study, into a full acceptance of its integrity and its historical worth — with such results as these the problem of the Book has largely disappeared.

And so with the Epistles of Paul. Outside of the Pastorals the problem of Paulinity has narrowed itself down to Ephesians, with possibly Colossians and Second Thessalonians, and these meet with less opposition at every fresh discussion of their questions. The Pastorals are yet in disfavor, and with them is included much that is extremely interesting in the chronology of Paul; but even here modern criticism is willing to say there is not merely a Pauline element, but this element is the larger part of the Epistles, and only that which is passing strange is placed upon the ample

shoulders of the editors who followed the Apostle. The Pauline problems also have thus largely disappeared.

From this array of problems it would be perhaps not unworth our while to take some one for our consideration. And yet, after all, there seem to me to be more urgent problems which lie beyond, — problems which come more into the heart of present discussions, and affect more vitally the fundamental questions of our historic faith.

For example, it would be a great thing if we could get fully settled the debated question of the formation of the New Testament Canon. That is to say, not merely if we could sift such patristic testimony as we have, so as to get at that which is true in it and that which is false; but if we could get behind this testimony into the first years of the sub-Apostolic Age, and find out how the Church came by the Books she has handed down to us; how she selected them from among others which she must have had at her disposal; what, in fact, was the principle on which she made the selection, — whether it was because she believed

these Books were specially inspired, and, if so, what her idea of inspiration was; whether she considered this was a peculiar gift, confined to the Twelve Apostles and to Paul, which made their writings uniquely authoritative; and, if so, how she came to accept such Gospels as those of Mark and Luke, and such a Book as Acts, and such Epistles as Hebrews, — if she questioned as to its being Paul's; whether she thought the authors of the Epistles of James and Jude were not the brothers of the Lord, and, if so, whether she was justified in the opinion; whether she thought Second and Third John were from a presbyter who was identical with the Apostle, and, if so, whether she was correct in her judgment; whether she considered that this peculiar gift of inspiration went out to others beyond the immediate circle of the Apostles, and, if so, how large she made this circle to be; whether, in fact, she may not have taken an entirely different view, so that it was not so much because she considered these Books specially and uniquely inspired, as because she considered them as giving simply the

literary remains of the Apostolic Age, and so gathered them together, independently of their specific authorship. In either case — whether she considered them uniquely inspired or simply historically Apostolic — was the Church correct in her selections?

It is a problem of engaging interest and of first importance. It opens out a way into the whole discussion of inspiration, and into the further discussion as to the extent of the actual Apostolic circle, — whether it was always confined to the Twelve and Paul; or whether, the Church having chosen from her own number one to fill the place of Judas, and Christ himself having added to that supposedly original sacred number one who had not been of their number, the impetus was given, especially as the work broadened out and grew more into Gentile lands, to add yet others to the thirteen, even though they might not answer strictly to all the requirements laid down in the choice of Matthias; so that *ἀπόστολος* is not to be taken in two senses of the word, one a stricter and one a more liberal sense, but only in one, which however might

be — most probably would be — strict and exact.

It would be a great gain further if we could come to a full agreement as to the relation which obtains between the Apostles and Jesus Christ, — whether Christ alone is the source of Christianity, or the Apostles also are sources with him; whether the Apostles are simply interpreters of Jesus's life and work, giving us the earliest Christian theology, whose value is confined largely to the fact that it was the earliest, with perhaps the added facts of keen intellectuality on the part of such an Apostle as Paul, and of deep spirituality on the part of such an Apostle as John; or whether they were authoritative heralds of the truth and fact that were essential to the completed announcement of Christianity to the world, standing after Christ in themselves, but standing along with him in their message; giving us in their Epistolary writings that which can be relied upon for belief and practice equally with the teachings of Christ, which come to us in the later written and only partially Apostolic-origi-

nating Gospels. In fact, what it was that Christ chose them to be and to do, when he selected them to their especial place and named them Apostles, — whether it was simply to cast out devils and heal the sick and announce the fact that the Kingdom of God was at hand, or whether it was to proclaim the truths of the Kingdom, and, if it was the latter, what warrant he gave them, and us, that they would proclaim these truths aright; whether what the Spirit promised them was, as the Synoptic narrative places it before us, simply to help them answer their adversaries, or whether it went beyond that, as the Fourth Gospel places it before us, to guide them into all truth regarding the things of Christ.

This is too a question of first importance. It comes, even more directly than the other, in touch with inspiration, and sweeps into its discussion a great part of our historic faith. Especially does it involve the cardinal points of atonement and Christology; since, at these points, our creeds are so largely based upon the Apostolic teaching. For these reasons then this latter problem is specially a problem

of to-day; for these are the doctrines men to-day are discussing, and, if Christology and atonement, if, in fact, inspiration is to be considered, the discussion, as far at least as criticism is concerned, must have much to do with this basal question of the relation of the Apostles to Christ.

As a matter of fact, we see how men are taking positions with reference to this very question to-day. It comes before us, in a crude way, in Tolstoi's "The Gospel in Brief," where, in order to give room for his own peculiar ideas, — to declare a Christianity which shall be, as far as possible, removed from the national evils which surround his countrymen, — he brushes aside all the Apostolic teaching as unauthoritative, and confines, not only the norm of Christianity, but also its content, to the teachings of Christ, which he then proceeds to interpret according to his own views.¹

It comes before us also in a more subtle way, in Watson's "The Mind of the Master," where, under the idea that he is exalting the

¹ The Gospel in Brief, transl., New York, 1896, pp. 10-12.

Master into his rightful place of divine authority, — or, at least, preventing his being subordinated to human levels, — but with the real purpose of holding himself free to pass judgment upon the Pauline teaching of the atonement, he says that the one fact which has to be laid down in the strongest terms and be held in perpetual remembrance is that Jesus gave, in substance, final truth, and that no one, Apostle or saint, could, or did, add anything to the original deposit, however much he might expound or enforce it; that this is the only position which secures a consistent and authoritative standard by which later teaching can be judged; and that, apart from Jesus's own words, it is established by two arguments: one from the fitness of things, — it being unlikely that Jesus, who came to declare the Divine Will and reveal the Father, would leave any truth of the first magnitude to be told by his servants; the other from the facts in the case, — certain doctrines of theology having become the sources of fierce repugnance and grievous scandal in the Church, notably the doctrine of reprobation, and certain cus-

toms of bad ethics having grown to be the established habit of many good people, notably the custom of slavery, simply because people went to the Old Testament and to the Epistles rather than to the Gospels for their texts. He admits that one may not deny the spiritual genius of St. Paul, his devotion to the person of Christ, his grasp of his Master's teaching, his power of working it up into an impressive dogma, his skill in applying Jesus's principles to the conduct of life, his unaffected love for man; but he holds that one may not make him equal to Jesus without removing Jesus from his judgment seat and destroying the proportion of Holy Scripture. In fact, he believes that it is a grave question whether St. Paul claimed to be on the same level of authority as Jesus, and that such a question can be settled, not by the production of passages, but rather by reference to the whole tone of the Apostle's letters.¹

This question comes to us finally in its most scholarly way in Wendt's "Lehre Jesu," his "Norm des echten Christentums," and his

¹ *The Mind of the Master*, New York, 1896, pp. 30-39.

“Die Lehre des Paulus verglichen mit der Lehre Jesu,” where it is held that the religious teaching of Jesus Christ, as the founder of the Christian religion, is the only norm for the settling of the true nature of this religion, and that the recognition of this character in Jesus’s teaching is the natural and necessary inference from the recognition of the revelatory significance of Jesus himself, and does not disturb his relation to the economy of redemption, nor destroy the unique value and worth of the Holy Scripture above that of other Christian literature. He holds that there is a real and inner agreement between the teachings of Jesus and those of Paul, — the Apostle having taken from Jesus that religious ideal which Jesus announced as the fulfilment of the pious hopes and promises of the people of Israel, in which lies his agreement with Christ, but having given explanations of this ideal and propounded methods for its realization which Jesus never intended, in which lies his disagreement with Christ. The cause for this deviation from Jesus’s teaching he believes is the fact that Paul was possessed of certain pre-

suppositions which belonged to him from his pre-Christian pharisaic environment.¹

Of these two farther-reaching problems our choice is to be rather in the direction of this second one, because of its present-day interest and importance for us, as well as because it may be said to lie more within the field of the New Testament itself. In the case of either of these problems however their special significance for to-day lies in the fact that in the New Testament field, as well as in that of the Old, the debate is being brought back to the fundamental lines which separate between the natural and the supernatural.

The real question with the Bible to-day is the philosophical one: Is God possible in the world? It has been for some time the background question in the Old Testament, as critics have asked: "Is Israel's history purely naturalistic; or is the supernatural element given to it in the Old Testament an actual

¹ *Lehre Jesu*, 2 Bde., Göttingen, 1886-1890, Vorwort, II. Bd.; especially Author's Preface and Introduction to Eng. transl., 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1892. *Die Norm des echten Christentums*, Leipzig, 1893, S. 50f. *Die Lehre des Paulus verglichen mit der Lehre Jesu*, Abdruck vom ZfTK, 1894, I. S. 75-77.

reality?" It is the background question in the New Testament, as the query is being made: "Is Christianity a purely naturalistic product; or is its claim to a supernatural origin a fact?" With such a position as Harnack takes — that the Christian religion is the outcome of a religious enthusiasm, which possessed the original disciples, plus the spiritual activity of the age¹—the New Testament apologetic is really pushed from historical and literary criticism back to philosophy. The question is no more whether patristic testimony carries these Books back into the first century. This is freely admitted to be the fact in the great majority of the cases. Nor is the question any more whether the New Testament Books give evidence of the specifically Apostolic authorship which they claim. This is really, after all, a matter of indifference; for, even with Apostolic authorship admitted, a supernatural origin for the facts and truths which they proclaim is practically denied, and so the debate goes back to philosophical lines.

¹ *Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur*, Bd. I., Leipzig, 1897, Vorrede.

But philosophical as the question essentially is, the part which criticism must take in it is a decided one; for, standing though these naturalistic critics do upon their philosophical bases, they make appeal to the New Testament in support of their positions; indeed, as we must respect their critical method, it is the study of the New Testament which has brought them to their position, however much their philosophy may have influenced the results. Pfleiderer studies Paul, and finds that the peculiarities of his theology are due to the pharisaism and the Hellenism of his previous life. His conceptions of sin and atonement and justification and predestination and the Messiah come from the theology of the Palestinian synagogue. His conceptions of the unspiritual character of the natural man and his renewal through the Holy Ghost, of eschatological things, and of certain elements in his Christology as well as in his conception of predestination come from the theology of Alexandrian Hellenism.¹ Sabatier studies Paul, and finds that his system of doctrine is

¹ *Der Paulinismus*, Leipzig, 1890², S. 20-30.

simply pharisaism transformed and inverted. His old ideas of God, of revelation, of righteousness and sin, of predestination and the resurrection, his anthropology, his angelology, and his hope of the Messiah were all of them simply brought over and carried through the progressive transformation of his mission life, under the influence of the Christian principle which had been placed within him.¹ Wendt studies Paul, and finds, as we have seen, that the peculiarity of his teaching is the presuppositions which he brought with him from his pre-Christian pharisaic life.

Now, when such study is given to the Apostolic writings, and the results are brought to bear upon the comparison between the teaching of Paul and Jesus, as they are especially by Wendt, and the position is taken that Paul deviates essentially from the teachings of Christ, it is, in fact, a matter of exegetical criticism upon which the stand is taken. For New Testament criticism, therefore, there is at least this task remaining; viz., to examine this standing ground in a fair and candid way,

¹ *The Apostle Paul*, transl., New York, 1891, pp. 50-53.

and ascertain whether it will support the position.

The plan which we propose then for these lectures is to make them gather around the problem of the philosophy, as it is involved in New Testament critical work. We shall preface it with a discussion of the problem of the method which should be used in such work; since this is fundamental to the work, and needful in giving clear ideas as to the spirit in which it is to be undertaken. We shall then place before ourselves the problem of the philosophy, and, when that is clearly stated, we shall apply it to the discussion. The application shall be first to the comparison between the teachings of Jesus and of Paul; afterwards it shall be to an investigation of one of Paul's doctrines, elaborated in the later part of his life. These lectures are not offered as exhaustive treatments of their themes. I fear indeed that they may not even seem to have a vital connection among themselves. Should this be so, let the apology be that they come before you merely as suggestive studies in the thought of our present day.

It is a day full of thinking, — full of thinking which declares itself as getting back, not simply to the Bible, but to Christ. It is thinking with which you are coming in contact here in the cloistered life of your seminary halls, but with which you will come in far more vital touch when you stand among men in the world of your parish, and find how deeply in their hearts are moving, and how profoundly into their lives are coming, these questions of atonement and reprobation, of the Christ of the Gospels, of the Epistles and of the creeds, of inspiration and the authority of the Scriptures, of naturalism and supernaturalism. If by what is here said some of you may be helped to a clearer knowledge of the truth, and thereby to firmer convictions in regard to it, I shall be profoundly grateful to God.

II

THE PRELIMINARY PROBLEM OF THE METHOD

THE question of method is obviously introductory. If anything is to be said about New Testament critical work itself, it must necessarily be prefaced with what is to be said about the method of that work. This problem paves the way for the others. It is first simply because it cannot logically stand anywhere else.

It brings into its proper prominence also the significance of the spirit to be maintained in such work. There is such a thing in work as the spirit with which it is done. There is such a thing in New Testament criticism as the spirit with which it is carried on. We may come to this collection of Greek documents with no other idea than simply to prove them Apostolic,—the canonical, authoritative Books of the Church. This is really an eccle-

siastical spirit. But if our spirit is ecclesiastical, it will become a secondary matter where we place our discussion of method,— in fact, a secondary matter what particular method we have. The one aim will be so largely the securing of Apostolicity for the Books that the specific process by which we go to work to secure it will remain in the background. On the other hand, we may come to these documents with the idea of finding out the literary and historical truth about them. This is a scientific spirit. But if our spirit is scientific, then it makes considerable difference whether we have a method or not, and where we place the discussion of what that method ought to be. In fact, the thing that will make our work scientific is the method which it has. Without method — without right method — it cannot be scientific. Its results may be pleasing to our fancy, and satisfying to our religious or churchly or denominational taste. They may even happen, now and then, to be right; but they can never be reliable, much less convincing, least of all, aggressively true. With method — and right method — the burden of

proof against the results which we reach must always rest with those who hold themselves to be our opponents.

We are perfectly aware of the risk we run in using the term "scientific." It is a term which is easily misunderstood for "liberal" as over against "conservative." Such a misunderstanding is hardly fair. There is a right and a wrong way to carry on any study. There is a right and a wrong way to carry on the study of New Testament criticism. The right way is scientific, the wrong way is unscientific. A scientific method is nothing more than a method that is right and not wrong. It would seem therefore that, whatever we may call ourselves, conservative or liberal or radical, or whether we call ourselves anything at all, we are under obligation, as searchers after the truth, to pursue the right method and not the wrong, the scientific and not the unscientific way. Consequently, what is proposed at the beginning of these lectures, is a plea for an honest, scholarly, scientific, right method in New Testament work; and this is proposed, not in the interests of any one school, con-

servative or non-conservative, but in the interests of the truth.

These are earnest days in which we live,—morally earnest days. In politics, in city government, in matters of capital and labor, in business, in work, to say nothing of professional study and practice, there never has been, as there is to-day, such need of right principles and methods in order to reach right results. We lose nothing of this need when we come to our theological life. There is conflict here between the false and the true. There always has been and always will be. False and true can never be anything else than opposed. It is perhaps more keen to-day than it was yesterday, will be yet more keen to-morrow than it is to-day. For this reason there seems to be an urgent call upon those who stand for the truth to stand for it on firm footing, to meet opponents on their own ground, and to show them what scientific process is, and what kind of process in New Testament criticism is unscholarly and untrue.

But in saying that our plea is for scientific method, we know we are running another risk,

and this is the risk of confronting ourselves with the question: "Where is the need for such a plea? Has not the right method been pursued all along? In proportion as supernaturalism has prevailed in New Testament criticism, has it not, from the very fact that it was supernaturalistic, been scientific in its work; so that such a plea becomes a plea rather of ignorance, and opens itself to the charge of trifling with the subject?"

It is just as well to have these questions pressed upon us at the start; for this brings us face to face with history and the present facts of to-day, and we believe these will show the reason there is in making the plea.

Some years before the first quarter of our present century there appeared in England a book on Bible introduction which was destined to have a very large and wide influence. It was written by Thomas Hartwell Horne of St. John's College, Cambridge,¹ and professed to

¹ The first edition was published in London in 1818 (3 vols. and supplement in 1821), and was soon reprinted in America. The last edition (11th) was published by the author, with the assistance of John Ayre, M.A., and Samuel P. Tregelles, in 1860 (4 vols.). The work found immediate and wide acceptance. In the preface to the second edition

give the reader everything that was necessary for entering upon a study of the Holy Scriptures. And it must be confessed it lived up to its profession. It gave everything. It was designed, in its author's words, as a comprehensive manual of sacred literature, and its design was kept steadily in view throughout its four volumes. As a consequence the reader had presented to him not only Introduction proper, general and special, to Old and New Testaments, but Evidences of a Revealed Religion, as given in the Scriptures, the Historical and the Physical Geography of Palestine, the Political and the Military Antiquities of the Jews, their Sacred Antiquities, their Domestic Antiquities, besides various Appendices, containing Tables of Weights and Measures, Lists of the Symbolism of Scripture, Dictionaries of the more distinguished Persons and Nations and Countries and Places, an Abstract of Secular History, from

the author says: "In addition to the extensive circulation which his work has obtained in the Universities and other Theological Seminaries in England, he has the satisfaction of knowing that it has recently been adopted as a text book in the College at Princeton, New Jersey, in North America."

Solomon to the Captivity, a Review of the Apocryphal Books, with the Reasons why they were rejected by the Church, a Review of the Miracles of Christ and the Difficulties attendant upon the Propagation of Christianity, and finally a Presentation of the Chief Prophecies concerning the Messiah, an Examination of the Genuineness of Josephus's Writings and a Refutation of the Principal Contradictions to Philosophy, to the Nature of Things and to the Morality falsely alleged to exist in the Scriptures. And so it went abroad with a reputation for scholarliness attaching to it that made it the book for the student's library.¹

One may not be disposed to question the fact that the mind that conceived such an undertaking and carried it through was a scholarly mind. An encyclopædia is not necessarily the product of ignorance. But an encyclopædic method is not the scientific method for the work of introduction to the

¹ It is interesting to notice that Horne's idea as to contents is presented in the work of the French scholar, Glaire, *Introduction historique et critique aux Livres de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament*, as late as its third edition (1861-1862). It first appeared in 1843.

Scriptures. There are some things we are supposed to know when we come to this discipline. The apologetic for a revelation from God in written form is a truth we assume when we take up the study of the Bible Books; and, even though we may have to confess that a course on the customs and manners of the Jews, and a thorough drill in the geography of Palestine may be all necessary for the average Junior Class, this is quite evidently not the place where it belongs. An introduction course is not a scrap-book process. It places itself before the documents for whose study it is to prepare, and simply concerns itself with the questions which they scientifically suggest: (1) The historical question as to how these Books came into the collection in which they are gathered; (2) the philological question concerning the characteristics of the language or languages in which they appear; (3) the textual question regarding the way to reach the text which they originally presented.¹

¹ There might be added to these a fourth question as to the hermeneutical principles to be pursued in the interpretation of the books; but this could be more easily deferred to the actual work of exegesis.

So we see that the continental reaction against Horne's method, naturalistic as it was, was nevertheless, in its underlying principle, right. This way of Horne's was not the proper way to study Introduction. The critics saw it, said so, and acted on what they said. And yet at the same time we see that this reaction, in swinging over to the opposite extreme where everything was eliminated from this discipline save simply a study of the Canon, was also, in the underlying principle, wrong. It may be said that the scholar-public knows the Greek language already too well to give up a part of Introduction to a study of its development from classic to Hellenistic forms; but it may be fairly answered that this is not the point. It is not whether the scholar-public knows New Testament Greek, as it is supposed to know Palestinian Geography and Evidences of Revealed Religion, but whether New Testament Greek belongs scientifically to the discipline of Introduction, as Geography and Evidences of Religion do not. If it does, then it ought to have a place in its study, and it is barely possible that, with regard to New Testa-

ment Greek, there may be some things yet to be learned, even by scholars themselves. It may be said, on the other hand, that Textual Criticism is too important a study to be thrust into such a prefatory discipline as Introduction; but again this is hardly the point. This discipline of Introduction would not be the unduly prefatory thing some critics contend it is, were it not for the fact that they thrust out of it the topics which logically belong in it, and which, if there in their proper relations, would lift it up to the dignity it claims and has a right to have. Indeed we cannot help but believe that it is a growing recognition of this fact which has led modern German scholars like Weiss,¹ and Holtzmann,² and Jülicher,³ and Zahn⁴ to give some sort of a place to these topics in their works; while Godet, in the opening sections of his recent Introduction, shows how the right of at least

¹ Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Neue Testament, Berlin, 1897⁸.

² Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das Neue Testament, Freiburg, 1892⁸.

³ Einleitung in das Neue Testament, Freiburg, 1894^{1&2}.

⁴ Einleitung in das Neue Testament, Leipzig, Bd. I. 1897; Bd. II. 1899.

some of these subjects to be treated has impressed itself upon him.¹ One could wish that English scholars were as far advanced; but Davidson seems to hold that the only topic which needs to precede the specific study of the individual Books is that of the text;² while Salmon, perhaps under the plea of printing his lectures, and Dods, apparently under the pressure of space which comes from writing a manual, leave us in the dark as to whether they think any topics at all should precede.³

It would seem that all this is scientifically just as unwarranted an extreme, on the one side, as Horne's had been on the other; so that it becomes evident that our plea for right method is not unjustified even here, in the discipline of General Introduction. The right way is not yet adopted by the critics whose

¹ Introduction à Nouveau Testament, Paris, Tom. I. 1893, pp. 3-10; transl., Edinburgh, 1894, pp. 1-8.

² An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament, London, 1894⁸. See preface to 1st ed., 1848.

³ A Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament, Salmon, London, 1894; see preface to 1st edition. An Introduction to the New Testament, Dods, New York, 1890³. On the other hand, see McClymont, The New Testament and its Writers, New York, 1893, ch. I.

work is placed before us to-day in their books. The discipline, as a discipline, seems to be misunderstood. Its true preparative relation to the critical study of the Books themselves is, to all appearances, lost sight of. Its scientific bearing upon the presuppositions with which we must stand before the question of authorship is evidently all confused. As a consequence, it has drifted into a position where it really serves no purpose to the all-important work which follows it; until the tendency is to drop it out of thought and plunge into specific criticism of the separate Books with the feeling that what may be said about the Canon and the language and the text is not so important after all; or if it is, it is so more as an outside and isolated question which can be very properly studied by itself. Such confusion and disorganization is what may be always expected when wrong method is indulged in, and an unscientific process is taken up.

But the importance of our plea will be further seen when we remember that this fault we have been discussing is, after all, only a formal fault. It has to do only with General

Introduction, which is preliminary to the real criticism of the individual Books; and it has to do with General Introduction only at the point of its contents, that is to say, in the question as to what topics shall be included in its scope. Now, if it can be shown that there is lack of scientific method in the study of the Books themselves, we think it will be granted that the plea is needful. For this study of the Books themselves is the real study. Here is the battle-ground for the critical life or death of the documents in the case. It is undoubtedly necessary that we should know about the gathering of these Books into the Canon; about the way in which they were regarded and used by the early Church, especially about the basis on which they were accepted into the Canon and made authoritative Scriptures to the Church. It is quite necessary that we should trace their ecclesiastical recognition and their historical acceptance as far back towards the Apostolic Age as we can. These things mean very much to us doctrinally, and consequently practically. But, after all, the vital critical question remains: How do the

Books themselves answer the claims we make for them? Suppose some of the early Fathers, like Papias, give us information regarding the origin of some of these commonly accepted Apostolic Books, and testify to their authoritative character, and the testimony is handed down along the patristic line, until it becomes universally received as historical by the Church, how are we to test this testimony save by a study of the Books themselves? How are we to understand what it means save by the light which a study of the Books themselves throws upon it? See what the study of the Synoptic Gospels has done with Papias's own testimony regarding the origin of Matthew and Mark.¹ Or suppose, on the other hand, that we find no testimony among the early Fathers to some of these accepted Apostolic Books which we have before us in the Canon, and it is said that, because they lack this early testimony, they have no right to their Canonical place, how are we going to test these charges save by a study of the Books themselves? See what a study of

¹ Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica*, III. 39.

the Pastoral Epistles may do with the position regarding them which radical criticism has been accustomed to hold. Here, without doubt, is the vital study. If the Books show themselves to be apocryphal and utterly unapostolic, something must be wrong with the testimony of the early Church, historical as it may seem to be. If, on the other hand, they show themselves to be genuine and thoroughly credible throughout, something must be wrong with the charges of the critics, masterly as they may seem to be.

It may be said indeed that this is a bold position to take. But we do not know that its boldness concerns us so long as the position itself is right. It may be urged that this is simply opening the gates to the flood of critical extravagance that we have in such documentary schools as that represented by Völter¹ and Steck;² but again we do not know that even

¹ See his *Entstehung der Apokalypse*, Freiburg, 1882 (1885²); *Offenbarung Johannis keine ursprünglich Jüdische Apokalypse*, Tübingen, 1886; *Problem der Apokalypse neu untersucht*, Freiburg, 1893; *Komposition der Paulinischen Hauptbriefe*, Tübingen, 1890.

² See his *Galaterbrief nach seiner Echtheit untersucht*, Berlin, 1888.

this concerns us, providing what we have done is the critically, scientifically right thing to do. Indeed, the fact that critics have reached absurd results in their work is rather a call upon us to show that the reason why they have reached them is because they have done their work in a wrong way, and this is to be accomplished, not by calling them away to some other battle-ground, where they have no possible concern to go, but by going straight upon their own field of action, and contending with them as to their position. The way Van Manen,¹ Sorof,² Feine,³ Spitta,⁴ and Jüngst⁵ are to be met in their documentation of the Book of Acts is by simply exposing the unscientific presuppositions which lead them to the forming of their documents. And the way that Clemen⁶ is to be met in his partitioning of the Epistles is by simply showing that the partitions which he makes are op-

¹ Paulus [I De handelingen der Apostolen], Leiden, 1890.

² Die Entstehung der Apostelgeschichte, Berlin, 1890.

³ Eine vorkanonische Ueberlieferung des Lukas in Evangelium und Apostelgeschichte, Gotha, 1891.

⁴ Die Apostelgeschichte, Halle, 1891.

⁵ Die Quellen der Apostelgeschichte, Gotha, 1895.

⁶ Chronologie der Paulinischen Briefe, Halle, 1893.

posed to literary and critical right. To try to engage such critics on philosophical or ethical or theological grounds is merely to beg the question with them; for, most likely, they do not hold to your philosophy or accept your ethics or believe in your theology. They are before you as literary critics of the narrative of a book, and, as such critics of the narrative, you must place yourself before them, which means, of course, that the vital point of contest is the Books themselves.

But if this is so, then, beyond all question, it is a foremost matter that we study these Books in the right and scientific way. Special Introduction wrongly carried out is no more right than General Introduction wrongly carried out; on the contrary, in proportion as it is the more important study, it is more importantly wrong.

How then stands the case regarding the method of Special Introduction? Before the reaction against Horne, this discipline stood very much in confusion, where indeed it can be said to have existed at all. Such scholars

as Simon,¹ Michaelis,² Semler,³ Eichhorn,⁴ and Hug⁵ present simply a bewilderment of critical process. The reaction against Horne however was really the advent of Tübingenism, and Tübingen's method of Special Introduction was to come to the Books with a preconceived historical idea, and, on the basis of that idea, decide their genuineness. The idea which they preconceived was historically false. This is generally recognized to-day;

¹ His principal critical works are *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament*, Paris, 1678 [this edition was confiscated through the influence of parties in the Church, only a few private copies surviving. The first regular edition, which however was practically a reproduction of the Paris edition, appeared from the Rotterdam press in 1685]; *Histoire critique du Texte du Nouveau Testament*, Rotterdam, 1689; *Histoire critique des Versions*, Rotterdam, 1690; *Histoire des principaux Commentateurs du Nouveau Testament*, Rotterdam, 1693; *Nouvelles Observations sur le Texte et les Versions du Nouveau Testament*, Paris, 1695.

² *Einleitung in die göttlichen Schriften des Neuen Bundes*, Göttingen, 1750.

³ Chiefly his *Vorbereitung zur theologischen Hermeneutik*, Halle, 1760-1769 (?); *Apparatus ad liberalem Novi Testamenti interpretationem*, Halae, 1767; *Abhandlung von freier Untersuchung des Canons*, Halle, 1771-1775.

⁴ *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 5 Bde., Göttingen, 1804-1827.

⁵ *Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, Tübingen, 1808.

but we are free to say that the method of the study, while not right, was a great advance upon what had been in service before. Though they came to the Books with prejudgments — prejudgments so strong that their criticism was all distorted and deformed — they came to the Books and studied them. They made them tell, or, at least, they fancied they did, the story of their origins. The method they used was in the right direction, though it was wrong. And we think we have benefited from it in the criticism which has succeeded Tübingen, and which we find around us to-day. Weiss and Holtzmann and Godet and Salmon and Jülicher are all of them critics of the Books themselves, and in so far their method is scientific and right.¹

Were we compelled however to take the method of these last-named critics as the ultimately and completely right one, we should consider New Testament criticism far from being at the point of power which it is possible for it to reach. In confirmation of such a statement we have merely to open the works

¹ See their respective Introductions, as above.

these scholars have given us, and to look at the way they carry through the study of the New Testament Books.

Holtzmann, in treating the Pauline Epistles, gives us:—

1. The historical situation of the Churches addressed and the author.

2. Motive behind the writing of the Epistle.

3. Contents of the Epistle.

4. Date of composition.

5. Genuineness of the writing, that is, where it may be in doubt; which discussion of genuineness consists generally in an outline review of the criticism, with a statement of the points in debate, without apparently any reference to external evidence. This varies in the case of the other Epistles and the historical Books, there being almost a different process with every Book.¹

Godet, in his volume on the Pauline Epistles, gives us, generally:—

1. The historical situation.

¹ The various methods of Holtzmann and the following critics here cited can be quite easily seen, even from a comparison of the tables of contents of their respective Introductions.

2. The contents of the Epistle.
3. The circumstances of its composition.
4. A discussion of its authenticity, if it is in question; in which discussion he gives us first the external evidence, then the outline of the criticism, then the discussion of the objections to the genuineness of the Book.

5. A last item, which he terms "Conclusions," does not however concern the results of the preceding criticism, but is simply a presentation of such fragmentary remarks as have no place elsewhere in the discussion.

Jülicher, in his treatment of the Epistles, gives us:—

1. The contents of the Epistle.
2. Its readers and the motive for its writing.
3. The date of its composition.
4. The authenticity, in which external evidence does not appear. This is varied considerably in the case of the Catholic Epistles, and more so in the historical Books.

Weiss gives us, in his handling of the Epistles:—

1. The historical situation.
2. The analysis of the Epistle.

3. An outline of the criticism in which he states and defends his own position.

4. This is followed by one or more items of critical interest, such as the date of composition, or the purpose of the writing, or the relation of the Epistle to other New Testament writings.

Zahn gives us, in his discussion of Paul's Epistles, a variety of method, which differs with each Epistle. The tendency seems to be, when the genuineness of the Epistle is in question, to consider:—

1. The historical setting of the Epistle.
2. To give a more or less detailed interpretation of the Epistle.
3. To discuss the Epistle's genuineness.

When the genuineness is not in question, there appears to be a lack of any method. With Salmon there is confessedly and professedly no method at all.¹

¹ This confusion is apparent in the Introduction portions of Holtzmann's *Hand Commentar zum Neuen Testament*, 1891, 1892; also of the recent new issues of Meyer's *Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament*, especially *Die Thessalonicherbriefe*, Bornemann, 1894^{5&6}; *Die Offenbarung Johannis*, Bousset, 1896⁵; *Die Briefe Petri und Judae*, Kühl, 1897⁶; *Die Gefangenschaftsbriefe*, Haupt, 1897^{6&7},

Now, surely there is something wrong about this. Not so much that one critic has one method and another has a different one; but that none of them has the method critically adapted to secure the most reliable results. With all, the criticism seems to have the fault of being made up of isolated points which have no connection among themselves. It is not merely that with one external evidence figures and with another it does not figure; but that one is puzzled to know what place such testimony has in criticism, or whether it has any place at all. It is not simply that in one case the Book seems to be analyzed before it is discussed, and in another it seems to be discussed before it is analyzed; but that one wonders what the logic of an inductive process really is, or whether there is any logic belonging to it. It is not only that with one critic there is a treatment of authenticity in which the main idea seems to be the statement of the debate, with another there is a treatment in and in the New Testament part of the *International Critical Commentary*, as far as issued: Romans, Sanday, 1895; Mark, Gould, 1896; Luke, Plummer, 1896; *Philippians and Philemon*, Vincent, 1897; *Ephesians and Colossians*, Abbott, 1897.

which the chief point seems to be the statement of the author's own position, while with still another there is a treatment in which the one concern appears to be the answering of objections against the Book; but the trouble is to determine what a discussion of authenticity really means, or whether it means anything at all.

The general impression one receives from all this is that the whole treatment of the special introduction to a Book is, in the critic's opinion, largely a treatment of separate items in the study of the Book. The general result which issues from it all is that New Testament criticism fails to secure to itself the strength it has the right to have. It is a criticism of skirmish and not of battle line. There is no charge, — no totality of effect. There is argument — plenty of it — here and there; but we fail to feel its gathered power as it proceeds from point to point. There is logic, — a great abundance of it at particular places; but we miss its march from one position to the next. The trouble is, the argument does not proceed and the logic fails to march. And so

the great thing in criticism comes to be, as we saw from the methods we placed in review before ourselves, the objections that are urged against the Books. In fact, if not in form, they have the first and foremost place; until, if the truth must be told, we spend our time in studying the objectors instead of the Books.

But if all this is so, then we think it must be admitted that a plea for scientific method in New Testament criticism is not an unjustifiable plea. And the question then at once arises: If there is this need of such a method, how and in what manner and way is the need to be supplied? The present method is wrong. Then what must be the method that is right? It is doubtless incumbent upon us to take this question up and try to answer it.

As we have seen, the need of scientific method covers both departments of Introduction, — General and Special. In the department of General Introduction the fault was that there was no scientific appreciation of what the contents of the discipline should be. Some summed them up under the one topic of the Canon; some gave a sketch study of Canon

and Text; some took up the special introduction to the individual Books, without any hint that they considered any preliminary topics needful.

Over against this confusion it is evident that there should be discussed, in this department of General Introduction, the full body of topics which make special study of the individual Books scientifically possible, whatever the number or order of these topics may be. Anything less than this, or anything more, makes the contents fail of being, as far as the science of criticism is concerned, right. And it is clear that this does not mean that each and every scholar can determine for himself what the scientific limit of these contents should be. He has the right and is under the duty to study the matter out; but the scientific limit of these contents cannot vary according to what he thinks is needful for himself or the readers of his work as preparatory to Special Introduction. They may vary, but they must vary according to what he believes belongs critically to the discipline itself.

On such a basis it would seem that there

must be, in General Introduction, some treatment of the problem of the Canon, for these Books come to us not separately, but in this historical collection; some treatment of the problem of the text, for their present form has a long ancestry of manuscripts behind it; and some treatment of the problem of the language, for their Greek is the outcome of a unique development from classical ideals. And if we are asked, why should not, in addition to these, the matter of Jewish antiquities be studied, or Palestinian geography, or the evidences of a revealed religion, the answer is not, because they have nothing to do with New Testament things, for they have; but because they are of such general import for Bible study that they rightfully belong to the earlier period of preparation for the knowledge of the Scriptures as a whole, — Old Testament and New. They are assumed before such critical work as we are discussing is undertaken, and we submit that the only reason why they are taught to those who are in the process of these higher studies is because the previous acquisition of them has been neglected.

On the other hand, we may study Greek as a general language, yet the topic of Hellenistic Greek is rightly introductory to the special study of the New Testament. We may study ecclesiastical history, yet the topic of the patristic opinions and acts regarding the New Testament Books is rightly introductory to New Testament special study. We may study paleography in general, yet the topic of the origin and preservation of the New Testament text is something which belongs specifically and critically to our special study of this Book. And we cannot help but feel that, just in proportion as we look at the contents of this discipline in this rightfully critical way, just in this proportion will it be elevated into the important and necessary place it properly can claim for itself.

But we must not forget that the more important part of our problem lies now before us. We have seen that the need of critical method covers Special as well as General Introduction, and that its fault, in this more special branch of the discipline, was, that there seemed to be no appreciation of the fact that this individual

study of the Books was a logical thing, and was to be carried on in a logical way, — the proofs being gathered together in a connected and cumulative argument. Over against this apparently self-hindering want of wisdom we ask the privilege of laying down one or two principles which, though they may not commend themselves at once, will, we trust, be admitted into consideration, and not, at least, be marked as arbitrary.

A. The first of these principles is that the Books should be studied from the point of their own claims.

This is evidently the only critically possible starting-point for work. We may begin from some other point within the Book, — its style, its argument, its theology, its hints at date and place and motive and circumstances of composition, and we may happen to arrive at most acceptable results; but it will be chance more than criticism that will bring us to them. It is to be remembered that we are confronted here with documents that not only bear upon themselves the impress of their origin, but also, as a matter of actual evidence, make more

or less definite statements regarding that origin. If then it be right, as Higher-Criticism must always hold it is, to study documents from the point of their birthmarks, it is also right to start this study from the point of the claims they make concerning their birth. "Paul, an Apostle of Jesus Christ through the will of God, and Timothy *our* brother, to the church of God which is at Corinth."¹ This is not merely the Epistle's sign and title in the world of letters; this is its claim in the world of criticism, — its claim to be a Pauline letter, — and criticism has no right to pass judgment on the Epistle, save as it begins its study of it from the point of this claim. It matters not what its style and diction may be, how its argument may run, what points its theology may cover. It matters not what may be its hints as to the circumstances of its writing, or whether it makes any hints at all. These are not starting-points for the study of the letter's origin, so long as the letter makes a claim of origin for itself. The letter has the right to insist that, if we

¹ II Cor. II.

are going to study it, we shall begin our study by finding out, first of all, what it says about its source, — whether it makes a claim of origin or not, and, if it does, what sort of a claim it makes, and, having found this out, that we shall place it before ourselves as the point in the letter's study from which we are to proceed.¹

B. But there is a second principle which follows necessarily from this point, and this is, that the Books must be accepted in proportion as they prove their own claims; and if it be asked how they can so prove them, the answer must necessarily be: By showing themselves to be consistent with what they claim.

It is clear, of course, how this must be the next position which we take, and what the taking of it means. Here is a New Testament Book, with a definite claim of authorship. Does the Book show itself throughout to be

¹ In view of such a principle it must require the strongest kind of evidence to come to the results which Harnack reaches in the case of James, I Peter, and Jude, and to eliminate the claims themselves from the Epistles, by declaring their opening verses to be later additions (see *Chronologie*, S. 456, 469 f., 489-491).

consistent with the claim it makes? Are the other marks which we may find here and there among its passages, — the general marks of style and diction and doctrinal views, the specific marks of the time when it was written, or the people to whom it was written, or the object with which and the circumstances in which it was written, — are these all consistent and in full agreement with the claim of authorship which it makes? If they are, then the letter has the right to hold itself, in so far, proved true, and the critical objections which may be made against its acceptance must be discounted by just so much before they are taken up to be considered. But if this is so, then there must be a distinct value in cumulating the evidence. The hints at time and place of composition which the Epistle makes, the motive of writing which it discloses, the readers to whom it shows itself addressed, the evidence of style and diction, the mode of argument and the character of doctrinal views which it gives us, — these are no longer isolated questions in its criticism; they are not now mere individual points of proof; they have a

common bond which holds them all together and a common object toward which they all tend, and this is the claim which the Epistle makes regarding its origin. Around this they all gather, either in support of it or in denial of it, or in a neutral way of non-committal toward it. In other words, we have a purpose in our study of the Epistle, — a critical purpose, — a logically critical purpose. It is to get at what the Epistle has to say in support of the position which it critically assumes. The Epistle is on the witness stand. It has made its plea. This is the cross-examination to which it must be subjected before the verdict can be handed in.

These two principles cover what is technically known as internal evidence. We believe they cover it in the right way, and that, in so doing, they place New Testament criticism in a far more advantageous position for discovering and establishing the truth about these documents which it is called upon to study. This involves no begging of questions ecclesiastical, historical, or critical; no conceding to prejudged objections or to assumed difficul-

ties. It brings us to a fair study of the documents themselves from the point of their own position and the facts which they themselves disclose.

C. But internal evidence is not all the evidence to be covered in the discussion. External evidence has its place in the argument, and its place is just here; for, in addition to the two principles which we have laid down, there is this one to be added: External evidence must be admitted at its full value, as it bears upon the study of the Book's self-consistency. We may have a document evidencing itself as self-consistent with its claims through all the line of its internal evidence; but if this is all the evidence that can be gathered together, the case of the document can hardly be said to be proved. Documents are historic things. They originate in time, in connection with events. They come from persons and places and peoples. If they come unnoticed by the life and the times in which they have been, if no one of their age or country has aught to say about them, if there is no historical witness to their existence, then

there can be no critical certainty regarding them, even though they stand before us altogether consistent with themselves.

It makes a large difference in the argument whether we have external evidence or not. If our documents be self-consistent, and we lack historical testimony to their existence, the question of their credibility and genuineness is at least in doubt. If they be self-consistent, and we have historical testimony, then this makes a confirmation of their truthful character against which critical objection cannot be urged with any self-respect. Take, by way of illustration, the disputed Second Thessalonians and run it through in its marvellous array of agreement with its companion Epistle, even in the antichrist prophecy of the second chapter, and its points of contact with the acknowledged Epistles of Paul, and then take these cumulated proofs and place them under the confirming light of patristic evidence from Origen and Clement of Alexandria back to Justin Martyr and Polycarp, and what is there left for objecting criticism to say?

We believe this is a position which would

find acceptance with every one, were it not for one objection which will be made against it, and this is: That the position involves a method of criticism which begins with internal evidence and brings external evidence in only by way of confirmation; while, as a matter of logic, external evidence should be placed at the front and be the point of primary proof from which we should approach the document. We must begin with patristic testimony, work back as far as we can, and, when we have secured all the historical foundation possible, then come to the document for what may yet be needed in its study.

We are perfectly well aware of all the force which goes with such an objection. These are days in which emphasis is laid upon historical method, and historical method in New Testament study seems to mean historical evidence first, internal evidence afterwards. These are days too in which we have suffered much from the vagaries and extravaganzas of literary criticism, in the New Testament as well as in the Old. Over against this it seems as though the safest method — the method most sound in

its principle and most sure of certain results — is to lay weight upon the historical argument, to confront literary critics with the overwhelming historical evidence in favor of the New Testament Books, and compel them to assume the burden of proof in their reading of them out of the Canon. But the stubborn question remains: Is this critically the right and proper method to pursue? The main point with these New Testament documents is their credibility, — that is to say, their reliability of fact and truth. If they be incredible writings, they are of no use to the religious life of the world; if they be credible, they are. But it may be said the credibility of the New Testament Books depends upon their historical origin in the Apostolic Age, on the principle that, in proportion as they come from near the beginnings of Christianity, in this proportion they are likely to give us credible truth and fact concerning it. This is so to a large extent. And yet credibility depends, in a still more decided way, upon these Books' own self-consistency, on the principle that a self-contradictory writing stamps itself as

unworthy of belief; while a self-consistent writing evidences itself as genuine and worthy of belief. In fact, these New Testament Books may lack patristic witness sufficient to carry them fully back into the first century; but if they be out and out consistent with themselves, what, after all, does this lack in the fulness of external evidence amount to? Is not this the real question with Second Peter? On the other hand, they may have patristic testimony ample enough to carry them into this century of the Apostles, and yet, if they betray themselves as inconsistent with the claims of authorship which they make, what is their first-century origin worth for our religious life? Get the Fourth Gospel back substantially into the Apostolic Age; still the problem is whether, even there, it may not contradict the claim it makes to have come from the hand of the Beloved Disciple. Get the Pastorals within the lifetime of Paul, still the query confronts us, whether the Books are or are not consistent with the claim they make to come, in their entirety, from this Apostle to the Gentiles.

If we had full and precise patristic testimony back to and contemporary with the Apostles themselves, there might be no question at all of credibility, as far as authorship claims are concerned; but such testimony we do not have. There is a gap, natural enough and necessary in the development of the Canon collection, but yet a gap, which makes such complete testimony out of the question. What then shall we do? Take such external testimony as we have, and then study our documents in the light of its presuppositions? Or, study the documents for themselves, and, with such results as we can secure, come to the confirming evidence of patristic testimony? The answer to this question would seem to be best suggested when we ask ourselves: What is it that we actually do when such new documents come to us as the Papyrus of Oxyrrhyncus?¹ Do we lay them aside, after a general acquaintance with what they purport to be, and go searching for external testimony regarding them? Or, on the contrary, after a general

¹ See Harnack's treatment of this find in his *Ueber die Jüngstentdeckten Sprüche Jesu*, Freiburg, 1897.

acquaintance with their purport and with the patristic statements regarding them, do we go to them themselves, for as exhaustive a study of them as it is possible to give, and then, with our results, go to the external evidence respecting them for just as thorough a study of it? Where does the primary investigation lie? There is not much doubt as to the actual method which has been pursued in these cases.

The difficulty with the Canonical Books is that we already have a large acquaintance with the Books themselves and with the patristic evidence concerning them before we begin our critical study; so that it is difficult to make clear to ourselves where we really begin, and, when we do begin with the documents themselves, we come to their criticism through the course of General Introduction, which acquaints us with the general fact of the collection of the Canon and the existence of the individual Books, — as far back as the Apostolic century perhaps, — and it is with these things in mind that we undertake our work. But when there comes before us a Book in dispute — the Fourth Gospel, the Epistle to the Ephesians, the

Apocalypse — and we give ourselves to a critical investigation of the dispute, we begin our investigation with a study of the Book itself, and end it with a study of the outside testimony concerning it.

There is no purpose here to undervalue historical research nor historical testimony when it is secured. The only question is, Where shall it be placed? What shall be the method of procedure in the case of a disputed Book? Shall we search patristic literature to determine its chronology and then come to study it for itself? Suppose patristic testimony should be particularly weak, as in the case of Second Peter, or decidedly troublesome, as in the case of the Pastorals, can we escape the prejudice this gives us against such Books? Suppose, on the other hand, we should find patristic testimony which would push back, say, the Gospel to the Egyptians to an equal date with the Gospel of John. Shall we come to the one with the same prepossessions for Canonicity as to the other? It is true we may not be able to escape prejudice in going from one branch of our investigation to the other;

but granting this to be so, if prejudice must be, for or against the Book, is it not critically fair that this prejudice should be gathered from a primary study of the Book itself, and that other sources of information should come in for confirmation of the results we there find?

D. And now just one final principle; for it is easy to be seen that the query will arise: What position shall external testimony have, and what weight and influence shall it exert when the Book perhaps may not so clearly evidence itself as out and out consistent with its claims, or perhaps as not making any distinct and definite claim at all? In answer to this query it would seem that we are bound to say: External evidence must be relied upon in full for deciding evidence where the Books make no claim, or are not clear in the proving of the claims they make.

This seems necessary as following from the principle just before laid down. If external evidence is confirmatory of internal evidence where positive results have been obtained, then where they have not been obtained—

where they are neutral or unfavorable — external evidence must decide, and where there is no internal claim at all, there external evidence must be the only actual evidence we have.

Take, for instance, the case of the Pastoral Epistles. There are recognized difficulties in the internal evidence, — vocabulary, make up of sentence construction, apparent Gnostic elements, especially a seeming want of contact with the narrated life of Paul. Over against these difficulties, to be sure, are facts which point significantly — very significantly — in the direction of a Pauline origin; but we come out of the study of these Epistles with the honest feeling that the question is somewhat in balance. If such be the case, then there is only one thing to do, and this is to go searching patristic literature for that testimony which shall settle the balance in one way or another, not simply for a usage of the letters by the early Fathers of the Church and an ascription of their authorship to Paul, but especially for such evidence as shall determine whether there was, or not, a second imprison-

ment of the Apostle, which might give an interval of travel and mission activity that would allow place for all the Epistles say about themselves. In fact, from this primary study of these Epistles it becomes evident that, just in proportion as they show themselves to stand before us as possible Pauline writings, just in that proportion are they records of such an interval of mission work, and consequently just in that proportion do they presuppose such an interval. So that the burden of proof, after all, rests with external evidence to show them out of keeping with Paul.

Take, again, the Epistle to the Hebrews. As far as definite claim of authorship goes, the Epistle, we know, makes none.¹ The most then that can be done, in the interval, is to study the letter and find what it shows us, in a general way, of its style and composition, of its doctrinal thought and philosophical views;

¹ Harnack is of the opinion that the Epistle may have originally possessed an opening address which contained the name of Barnabas as its author, so accounting for the Tertulian tradition. This however he admits is largely conjectural, and, at all events, does not alter the problem we have in the Epistle, as it stands before us. (See *Chronologie*, S. 475-479.)

what hints it gives that would lead us to say when and where it was written; what statements it makes as to the people, to whom it was addressed; what it discovers to us as to the purpose of its writer. Gather the results all together; perhaps they will fit into the life and work of Paul, perhaps not. What then? The only thing to be done is to go pushing out into the historical field and trace back the testimony that the Church has given to its origin. And so we see that this is just why the question of this Epistle's authorship remains to-day in doubt. We go searching out into this historical field, and we find not one line of testimony, as in the Synoptic Gospels which make no claim of authorship, but we find three, and three that we might almost say were parallel in their critical worth. We cannot be surprised therefore that even to-day we read such strange ideas about the origin of this Epistle as we do. We are resting for the decision of the question on external evidence, and external evidence, so far, has refused to decide.

This then places before us the problem of

the Method. In a word, it resolves itself into this question: Shall we start our study with what the Books say about themselves, or with what others say about the Books? Criticism has nothing to fear, as to the results of its work, providing its method is right; it has much to fear, if its method is wrong. And it seems as though one of the hardest things criticism has to fear, when its method is wrong, is the taunting sneer which is quite sure to be made that it cares more for the conservatism of its results than for their critical correctness. We need a method in which we can place our critical faith; for our method will either dignify or demoralize the work we do.

III

THE PROBLEM OF THE PHILOSOPHY

IN the preceding lecture it was the purpose to show that, in the evident confusion of the contents of General Introduction and the apparent aimlessness of the discussion of Special Introduction, there was a certain justification in the plea for a scientific, or, if this word seem boastful and arrogant, a critical Method.

It was suggested, as far as General Introduction was concerned, that those topics should be admitted to the discipline, and only those, which essentially belonged to the critical study of the New Testament, and that such a reconstruction of the material would be of great service in lifting up the discipline itself to a more self-respecting place in the critical world.

It was suggested that, in Special Introduction, the method should be to make the study take its point of departure from, not only the

document itself, but from the document's own claims regarding its origin; to gather around this starting-point such other facts and hints as it made regarding itself, either in support of, or in opposition to its claims; and then, with these results of internal evidence so secured, to go out into the field of external evidence for such patristic testimony as is possible to obtain, be it confirmatory of, or contradictory to these results. The object of the study is to obtain facts and so to arrive at the truth. It is not a question of theories to support, nor of prejudices to sustain, save such as come critically from the study of the document itself, and these it is right there should be.

This position has not been advanced in any spirit of hostility to historical research as such. It is admitted, as every student must admit who recognizes the difference between objective and subjective evidence, that historical study has given us facts which are of the highest class of values. And it is believed, as it must be believed by every student who recognizes how much there is yet to be studied

in what has been discovered in this field, and how much there may yet be discovered in it, that many of the problems of the future — many of the deciding and once-for-all-settling problems — lie here. The claim is simply that, as far as method of procedure is concerned, *Special Introduction* will not have rightly studied the facts it has before itself for discussion, — will not have dealt with them as they have a right to ask that they be dealt with, until it has studied them and dealt with them in this way.

Fortunately few of the New Testament Books are now in dispute. Many, if not most of them, are admitted to be what they claim to be; so that the questions which remain in these Books for *Special Introduction* to handle are largely of secondary concern. But there are some of the Books which are yet disputed. With these, in our opinion, the question will be critically undertaken in the method advanced in the above position.

It is to be hoped therefore that the problem has commended itself as an important one. Any problem which lies at the foundation

point is likely to be an important one from the very position which it occupies. It will be a matter of satisfaction if this one has lost nothing from the discussion which has been given to it.

At the same time the problem of this lecture is one which it is not believed will be found to yield in importance to the one which has just been discussed. It is not meant by this that it is a problem which rests upon foundation lines. It has not to do, as the problem of method has, with the preliminary study of Special Introduction. It has to do with the study of New Testament Introduction as a whole, — with what is involved in New Testament criticism generally. It has to do with the history of the life and the thought of the Apostolic Church. It is the problem of the Philosophy. And it will be seen naturally that in giving it this name, while it is not considered the foundation problem of New Testament work, it is considered fundamental. It may not be, in logical order, the first problem to be treated, as the problem of method is, but it is not for this reason a logically un-

important problem with which to deal. Method may be the standing ground from which is managed the mechanism of our work; philosophy must be the atmosphere in which the work is done. It may not enter into the structure of the mechanism itself; it may not condition it nor influence it; but when the mechanism is set to working, it cannot help but influence and condition the results which it produces.

This must be clear. Present-day problems of New Testament criticism can hardly be considered without bringing into a foremost place the problem of the philosophy. And if the reason for such a statement be asked, the reply is: (1) partly because, in general, criticism necessarily implies a philosophy which stands behind it and conditions its results; (2) and partly because, in particular, the criticism of to-day is influenced by its philosophy in a most interesting and instructive way. For, as to this first point, it is evident that philosophy really conditions our intellectual attitude with regard to every subject, — not consciously in every case perhaps, but really and in fact.

We may not dignify with the name of philosophy the reasons why we take a certain view of sociology, for example, but these reasons are likely to be the philosophy we hold of the social order of things. If it is theistic, our view is likely to be of one kind; if it is deistic, it is likely to be of another. We may not consider that philosophy has much to do with our relation to literature and art, but it undoubtedly has. A mystic will not face these elements of culture as a materialist will. The new fiction is not idealistic in its background any more than it is ideal in its aim.

So, it is evident, philosophy decides our approach towards Biblical criticism. If we be supernatural in our thinking, miracles will be assumed as possible, and will not consequently form a point of attack in our critical work. If we be naturalistic in our thinking, miracles will turn to myths, and their presence in any document will be a primal proof against its credibility.¹ This has been the history of

¹ "Natural" and "supernatural" are used here as, on the one hand, denying, and, on the other hand, affirming, the direct working *ab extra* upon nature of a personal God.

criticism, both New Testament and Old. It always must be. We cannot rid ourselves of our philosophy. It controls us whether we will or not. We may push the whole New Testament Canon back into the Apostolic Age, but, as long as we believe the Christianity of the Apostles was due to mere religious enthusiasm, — with what spiritual activity was possible in such times, — we shall be prejudiced in our critical study of the documents we have in hand. There is indeed a sense in which our philosophy will condition the very method of our critical work; for the more negative our philosophy, the more radical our handling of criticism is likely to be; so that, from a certain point of view, this problem of the philosophy might have been the first to be discussed; though, in our opinion, there has been a gain in clearness of thought by keeping it until now.

The first proposition then, that criticism necessarily implies a philosophy which stands behind it and conditions its results, is quite evident. The second proposition, that the criticism of to-day is influenced by its philoso-

phy in a specially interesting and instructive way, while perhaps not so evident upon its face, will, we feel sure, become so after a reminder or two.

Modern writers have a habit of lauding the rationalistic criticism which followed the Reformation. The reformers' work, they say, soon descended into mere text citations from error-proof documents, until there was left among so-called scholars not even the shadow of the critical spirit that had begun to dawn with Protestantism. Then came the radical development which threw proof texts away, and unfortunately a great deal else besides, but gave new life to criticism by enthroning, once for all, the truly critical spirit which studied the documents, in and for themselves, on the principle of reason.¹

All this is doubtless, to a great extent, true; but the interesting thing about it is that this

¹ See Zöckler, *Handbuch der theologischen Wissenschaften*, Nördlingen und München, 1889-1890³, Bd. I. Abth. I. S. 40-54; Abth. II. S. 3 f., 275-280. Also Weiss, *Lehrbuch der Biblischen Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, Berlin, 1880³, S. 16-19, and Beyschlag, *Neutestamentliche Theologie*, Halle, 1891, 1892, S. 11-16.

rationalistic criticism was the outcome and result of the rationalistic philosophy of Leibnitz and Semler. The latter of these philosophers was himself a Biblical critic, doing his work necessarily in the spirit of his philosophical thought. He attacked the traditional view of the Canon, which held it to be a homogeneous whole, inspired equally in all its minutest parts. He was for believing, not only that the gathering of the Books together was an accidental affair and not based on any fixed plan, but that the Books themselves were not designed to be a norm of faith for all men everywhere; that there was much in them that was not to be accepted; that, in fact, they were to be explained and understood only by understanding the purpose for which they were written and the historical environment of their writers; and that they could be held to be of divine origin only in so far as their contents showed them to be of a moral character serviceable generally to men of all times.¹

¹ See especially his *Abhandlung von freier Untersuchung des Canons*; also his *Sammlungen über die sogenannten Beweisstellen in der Dogmatik*, 2 Bde., Halle und Helmstadt, 1764-1768.

The rationalistic philosophy of Leibnitz and Semler however gave way before the destructive system of Kant, — a system which unintentionally, and yet logically, afforded the starting-point for the panegoism of Fichte and the panlogism of Hegel. In the midst of this development appeared Schleiermacher's philosophy of heart perception, whose purpose was rather to provide a *modus vivendi* for vital religion than a scheme of metaphysics for a speculative school. Under the influence of this philosophy was produced a subjective Biblical criticism which continued to study the documents themselves, but studied them on the principles of feeling rather than of reason.

This was the era of the study of John's Gospel and of the history of the Apostolic Church. It was the beginning too of the construction of lives of Christ. Schleiermacher wrought on the origin of the Gospels, and made contributions which did much to help criticism along towards the truth of the Synoptic and the Johannine problems.¹ Neander issued his

¹ See his Ueber die Schriften des Lukas — Ein kritischer Versuch, I Th. [II Th. never appeared], 1817, and his Ein-

Planting and Training of the Christian Church, and, in opposition to the negative work of Strauss, produced his constructive Life of Jesus.¹ Tholuck wrote his Evangelical Commentaries on Romans and Hebrews and John, and, together with Neander, stood champion for the credibility of the Gospel history over against the mythical theory of Strauss.²

leitung in das Neue Testament, aus handschriftlichen Nachlasse und nachgeschriebenen Vorlesungen (1829-1832) in his Sämmtliche Werke, 30 Bde., Berlin, 1835-1864, Bde. II. and VIII. Schleiermacher retained enough of the rationalistic spirit to be free in his critical views, going through the New Testament with a liberalism which succeeding criticism has, at some points, shown to be untenable. (See his Einleitung.)

¹ Geschichte der Pflanzung und Leitung der christlichen Kirche, 2 Bde., Hamburg, 1832 (1847⁴), — transl. (1) Edinburgh, 2 vols., 1842; (2) New York, 1865 (?); Leben Jesu, Hamburg, 1837 (1845⁴), transl. New York, 1848. Neander also contributed to evangelical exegesis in short practical expositions of some of the New Testament Books, *e. g.*, Philippians, James, and I John.

² Auslegung des Briefes Pauli an die Römer, Berlin, 1824 (1842⁴), transl. Edinburgh, 2 vols., 1833-1836; Commentar zum Evangelium Johannis, Hamburg, 1827 (1857⁷), transl. Boston, 1836; Kommentar zum Briefe an die Hebräer, Hamburg, 1836 (1850³), transl. Edinburgh, 1852; Die Glaubwürdigkeit der Evangelischen Geschichte, Hamburg, 1837 (1838²).

Though working mostly under the influence of Schleiermacher's philosophy of feeling, Tholuck showed a distinct

All this was under the influence of Schleiermacher's philosophy; but, in view of the emphasis placed by this school upon the feelings, it is perhaps not surprising that, in philosophy, it took no distinctive stand against the sceptical element in Kant; while, in criticism, it did not hesitate to accept results from the rationalism which had gone before. There was nothing therefore in the subjective criticism of Schleiermacher's day to prevent the advent of Tübingen's historical criticism; simply because there had been nothing in the heart philosophy of Schleiermacher which necessarily opposed the scepticism of Kant.¹

advance upon his leader in an appreciation of the need of a historical apologetic as basis for the Christian faith. The same may be said, in general, of Neander. This was doubtless largely due, in both cases, to a realizing of the metaphysical lack in their philosophy, — a lack which would naturally become more evident in the face of new attacks upon the historical basis of Christianity, such as was given by Strauss. (See Vorrede to Tholuck's *Glaubwürdigkeit*; also Vorreden to various Auflagen of Neander's *Leben Jesu*.)

¹ In any consideration of the destructive force of Kant's philosophy it must be remembered that, while its actual outcome may be scepticism, in the traditional sense of the word, yet this was not the purpose, nor the spirit of his system. He did not deny the existence of the soul, nor of God; all he held was that they were ideas, — synthetic forms of thought,

In Hegel's philosophy Tübingenism had its standing ground. It would not have been possible without it. The Hegelian philosophical theory was the very principle which made possible the Tübingen conception of early Christian history. It rested on the idea of a Gospel starting-point, the antithesis of an Apostolic conflict, and the synthesis of a second-century reconstruction. Here is the explanation, not simply of Baur's brilliant effort, but of the universal acceptance which it obtained. It swept the field, simply because the philosophy on which it based itself had

behind which might lie reality, but whose reality could not be proved by reasoning. His combat was more with the theoretical dogmatism — rationalistic as well as traditional — than with moral faith. The way was thus opened for Schleiermacher's philosophy, which, being a philosophy of religion rather than of pure thought, formed an addition to Kant's system rather than a criticism of it. As far as Schleiermacher was a philosophical disciple of Spinoza, his views may be considered a development of the Spinozistic system introduced into Germany by Lessing and Herder. These views were contemporaneous with Fichte's and Hegel's, and, in a certain sense, were a criticism of them; but they were promulgated more as a theology than as a philosophy, and did not, strictly speaking, enter the metaphysical field with these systems. (Weber, *History of Philosophy*, transl. [fr. 5th French ed.], New York, 1896, pp. 462-472, 473, note 4, 475.)

prepared men's minds to see in it the only explanation of the New Testament narrative of the Apostolic Church, and the only assortment of the documents which claim to come down to us from that Church.¹

Tübingenism has passed away now largely through the influence of the movement led by Ritschl, who, in his rejection of all metaphysics in religion and his emphasis of personal experience in the Christian life, most significantly opened the way for the later criticism of the Germany of to-day. There is left hardly any one who cares to do the old criticism reverence. In its place has come a newer criticism, which meets the difficulties of New Testament literature, not so much by denying Apostolic origin, in the broad sense of the term, to the documents which it presents to us, nor even by misexegeting the statements which the documents contain; but rather by saying that, though everything may come from Apos-

¹ If it was Hegel's interpretation of history that gave his system its success, it is not difficult to see how thoroughly Hegelian Tübingen's criticism was; since it is this interpretation of history which was the life of its critical scheme. (Seth, *Hegelianism and Personality*, Edinburgh, 1893, p. 179.)

toloc sources, and everything may exegetically mean what it has been generally claimed it meant, yet, as over against the primary statements of Christ, there is little or no authority in the complicated theology of the Apostolic writings; because the metaphysics by which they differentiate themselves from Christ's plain and simple teachings have been unconsciously borrowed, either from Jewish Rabbism or pagan philosophy. The Apostolic theology is a simple case of development of thought, in which development outside elements have been inserted to such an extent as largely, if not wholly, to destroy the identity of truth, and consequently to render Apostolic teaching, as over against Christ's teaching, unauthoritative. The "Lehre Jesu" is the "Norm des Christentums." Where the Apostolic Lehre cannot square with this by any consistent development of ideas it must be given up as the product of foreign ideas. This, we believe, is a fair presentation of the distinctive position of to-day's criticism. We cannot blame the Apostles perhaps, but, at the same time, we cannot believe them.

They were only interpreters of Christ as we are to-day — interpreters influenced by their training and their surroundings — and are of no authority, not even in their nearness to Christ, whom they would interpret; for we live later than they did, and have had more time to think and more helps in our thinking.¹

¹ This position manifests itself in various phases through an extended literature; it is most clearly shown however in such works as Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu*, 2 Bde., Göttingen, 1886–1890, Bd. II. S. 10–12, also Vorwort, S. viii (especially author's Preface to Engl. ed., 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1892); also his *Die Norm des Echten Christentums* (Nr. 5, der Hefte zur christlichen Welt), Leipzig, 1893, S. 24–44, 50 f. Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, 3 Bde., Freiburg, 1886–1890, Bd. I. S. 39–67, 88–94; *Grundriss der Dogmengeschichte*, 2 Bde., Freiburg, 1889–1891, Bd. I. S. 6–14; *Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur*, Bd. I. Vorrede, S. x–xii. Pfeleiderer, *Das Urchristenthum*, Berlin, 1887, S. 153–189; also 2d ed. of his *Paulinismus*, Leipzig, 1890, S. 18–33. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Theologie*, 2 Bde., Freiburg und Leipzig, 1897, Bd. II. S. 203–225. Holsten, *Zum Evangelium des Paulus und des Petrus*, Rostock, 1868, S. 65–115; *Das Evangelium des Paulus*, I Th., Berlin, 1880, Vorwort. W. Mackintosh, *The Natural History of the Christian Religion*, New York, 1894, pp. 386–440. Watson, *The Mind of the Master*, New York, 1896, pp. 25–45. Tolstoi, *The Gospel in Brief* (translated), New York, 1896. See author's Preface. Orello Cone, *Paul, the Man, the Missionary, and the Teacher*, New York, 1898, Preface and Part I.

On the basis of this position there is apparently what might almost be termed a tendency towards the traditional

When now we come to ask for the philosophy which stands behind their position and condi-

exegesis of the Pauline Epistles, the idea being that, Paul's doctrinal views having no authority, they may be accepted in their evident grammatical sense without concern as to whether they do, or do not harmonize with what must be understood to be the truth. In fact, in so far as they may seem to be peculiar, they are the more easily understood as due to the Apostle's previous Jewish training, or his earlier association with Greek thought. This tendency does not, of course, show itself with equal prominence in all the range of the more liberal criticism of the day, nor will each critic be found to follow it equally throughout his work; but when such passages as the following are taken up, and the interpretations given to them by the critics here named are compared, either with the traditional interpretation or with the usual attempts at explanation by those who do not accept the traditional view, the tendency shows itself quite clearly to be a fact.

(a) Rom. 5: 12-21: Pfeiderer (*Paulinismus*, Leipzig, 1873, S. 39-46) [at same time notice altered view in his *Urchristenthum*, Berlin, 1887, S. 178-181, and in 2d ed. of his *Paulinismus*, Leipzig, 1890, S. 50-60, which however stands nearer the traditional than the rationalistic interpretation]. Holtzmann (*Neutestamentliche Theologie*, Freiburg und Leipzig, 1897, II. S. 44-46, 112). Wendt (*Die Lehre des Paulus*, S. 33-35). Holsten (*Das Evangelium des Paulus*, II Th., Berlin, 1898, S. 55, 66, 80-98, 109).

(b) Rom. 9: 14-24: Pfeiderer (*Urchristenthum*, S. 281-290; *Paulinismus* (1890², S. 261-274). Lipsius (*Holtzmann'sche Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament*, Freiburg, 1892², II², sub loc. Cone, Paul, Ch. XVI).

(c) Phil. 2: 5-11: Pfeiderer (*Paulinismus*, 1873, S. 146-149, 1890², S. 127-131; *Urchristenthum*, S. 217 f.). Holtzmann

tions its results, we are confronted with a very interesting state of things in the trend of thought which at present obtains in the home of modern criticism.

It is perhaps quite a natural fact that, when Kant gave his philosophy to Germany, it was the metaphysical side of it which was given the treatment by the philosophers who immediately followed him; because it was a metaphysical condition of things which obtained when that system was promulgated and which its promulgation was intended to meet.¹ If this is so, then perhaps it will not be considered so remarkable that one side of Kantianism

(*Neutestamentliche Theologie*, II. S. 81-89). Wendt (*Lehre des Paulus*, S. 45-48).

(d) II Cor. 5: 15-21: Pfeiderer (*Paulinismus*, 1873, S. 101-104, 1890², S. 138-140; *Urchristenthum*, S. 223-225). Holtzmann (*Neutestamentliche Theologie*, II. S. 110 f., 127). Wendt (*Lehre des Paulus*, S. 50-55). Schmiedel (*Holtzmann'sche Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament*, II¹, sub loc.). Holsten (*Das Evangelium des Paulus*, II Th. S. 54, 56 f., 71 f., 104-106). Cone, *Paul*, Chs. XI.-XIV.

¹ We must recognize that, in proportion as Kantianism held there were two parts in every philosophical system, — a rational and an empirical part, — it was quite possible that, in its own system, one of these parts should have been developed at the expense of the other. (Weber, *History of Philosophy*, p. 475.)

having reached its climax in Hegel, and Hegel having been regarded a failure, German thought should now be going back to Kant, to take up that side of his philosophy which was undeveloped by his immediate disciples, — the empirical side. At all events, this seems to be what has been done; so that the Neo-Kantianism of Germany to-day is little else than the scepticism of Hume and the agnosticism of Spencer modified by the pantheism that has been. It is naturalism somewhat transcendentalized that is the present mode of German thinking.¹

¹ It may be said that, in a certain sense, Schelling prepared the way for such a return to the other side of Kant by the two systems which his philosophic thinking produced, — the one idealistic, the other realistic; while the idea of development contained in the Hegelian notion of the becoming of being under the impulsive force of contradiction furnished an opening for the evolution element in the empiricism, which was worked out, through such thinkers as Herbart and Schopenhauer, into the materialism of Feuerbach and Häckel and the positivism of Helmholtz and Wundt. In fact, Hegel's notion of the creative idea is substantially the evolutionist's notion of force matter. In all this was really constituted the full development of Locke's empiricism, which had been temporarily checked by the idealism from Kant to Hegel. (Weber, *History of Philosophy*, pp. 495-536, 561 f., 586 f. Seth, *Hegelianism and Personality*, pp. 200-203.)

The strange thing about this however is the fact that, at the same time this return process has been going on in Germany, there has been a somewhat similar process going on in England, though of an almost directly opposite character.

When Hume gave his philosophy to England, it was the empirical side which was made prominent, and it was this empirical side which was taken up by his followers and worked out into the agnosticism of Spencer and Huxley, with whom it has come to an extreme development. Now England seems to be turning from its empiricism and taking up metaphysics, which had been for the most part unemphasized by English philosophy since Locke. It is the absolute that is being philosophized about in England to-day. It is the panlogism of Hegel, modified by the Scotch philosophy that has been, which is now popular in Britain; so that the Neo-Hegelianism of the present is, in fact, a turn from English empiricism to German idealism. In other words, English thought to-day tends to emphasize metaphysics, while the tendency with

German thought to-day is to emphasize experience.¹

Now then recall the present state of criticism, and see how it falls into line with this present philosophical condition of things.

¹ The possibility, in the Kantian system, of the logical identity of the Ego with the Thing-in-itself has doubtless given opportunity for the Neo-Kantianism of England to convert Consciousness as a necessary condition of knowledge into Consciousness as a knowing Personality, and, in so far as the former Consciousness was general, to make the latter Consciousness universal, and so ultimately to deify what was, strictly speaking, an abstract unity of thought. This, of course, has been aided by the idealistic modification of Kant in his own country, through which the possible logical identity of the Self and the Non-Self was formulated into an actual dictum, and so a theory of knowledge transformed into a metaphysic. At the same time it may not be improbably said that, in England itself, an opening for a return to metaphysics was furnished, not simply in the spiritualistic protest of the Scotch philosophy to the particularistic scepticism of Hume, but in the idealistic admissions of the agnosticism of Spencer and Huxley themselves. In short, the philosophical development, both in Germany and in England, makes evident that no philosophy gives us an absolute system, either exclusively idealistic or exclusively empirical. (Weber, *History of Philosophy*, pp. 475-478, 581-587, 594-600. Seth, *Scottish Philosophy, Lectures I., IV.*; *Hegelianism and Personality, Lectures I., II., III., and Conclusion*. John Caird, *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion*, Glasgow, 1891, Chs. I., II., and III. Edward Caird, *The Evolution of Religion*, 2 vols., Glasgow, 1893, Vol. II. pp. 61-63, with note.)

Germany is the home of Biblical criticism, and we find the criticism of to-day essentially controlled by this German emphasis on experience. This is indeed the meaning of the change that criticism has undergone. It accounts for the fact that such emphasis is placed upon the environment influence on the Apostolic mode of thought, — the environment of early training, the environment of later life and work. Here is the reason why there is such insistence upon the idea that the Apostolic theology is simply an individual interpretation of Christ's teachings; for the claim is that, Christ's teachings once given, there began immediately a process of human developing of them under pressure of the environment which conditioned the Apostles in their mission work, — a moulding of them under human influences, a manipulating of them from human points of view; so that "Dogmengeschichte" began with the Day of Pentecost, if not in the week preceding, which followed the Ascension. The Church received the truth from Christ, and then began at once to develop it. The Apostles were simply leaders

in the Church, and did the chief moulding of views; for they were the ones who, by common consent, did the Church's thinking. Their formulation of what Christ taught was accepted as authoritative church opinion; but, after all, it was merely *post Christum* ideas regarding Christ's own teaching that they give us, — merely early church interpretations of who he was and of what he did and what he meant to say. It has no more authoritative relation to Christ's teaching than this. It is no vital part of this teaching. It is simply a theology that they have worked out, — a Pauline theology, a Petrine theology, a Johannine theology, — and the sources from which they severally come, the sources that differentiate them from each other, — that make Paul's Pauline and Peter's Petrine and John's Johannine, — are to be found, largely if not wholly, in these facts of environment in the individual cases. Rabbinic training, with the struggles of his mission work, give us Paulinism. Theocratic ideas and Jerusalem surroundings give us Petrinism. Ephesian residence and Oriental philosophy give us Johanninism, — if indeed there be in

the New Testament writings any theology which we can say has come to us from John's pen. In each case it is a simple question of environment and development. From the principles of environment come the forces which make the Apostles' theology differ from the teachings of Christ; from the principles of development come the forces which make their theology a human thing of mere interpretation, under pressure of surrounding experience, and not a divine thing of authoritative inspiration. There is thus a sense in which their thinking is not a development of Christ's, although it be controlled by this principle of development, — a sense in which therefore modern criticism has to explain itself and try to defend itself against the charge of inconsistency and arbitrary division of terms.

To sum up then it is a criticism controlled by the present-day trend of philosophical thinking in the land where criticism has its home, and this trend of thinking is along evolution lines. The result is a criticism which is naturalistic enough to give us a cold and

perfectly careless exegesis of New Testament thought, and, at the same time, evolutionary enough to posit environment and development to account for the thought it has to exegete.¹

And here is the reason why documentary analysis occupies so large a space in modern critical processes. The idea of evolution is behind this also and involved in it; for documentary partition means documentary growth, — development through combinations and recensions to the final and full arrangement by the last redactor, — and, along with this documentary growth, there goes in the critic's mind a development of the history which produced the different document stages. The beginning is generally marked by simple ideas which produce simple documents; the growth gener-

¹ Evidences of such critical tendencies among German writers may be seen in Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu*; *Die Norm des echten Christentums*; *Die Lehre des Paulus verglichen mit der Lehre Jesu*. Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*; *Grundriss*. Pfeiderer, *Urchristenthum*; *Paulinismus*. Holtzmann, *Neutestamentliche Theologie*. Holsten, *Das Evangelium des Paulus*. Holtzmann, Lipsius, V. Soden, and Schmiedel in *Holtzmann'sche Hand-Commentar*. Sabatier, in his *Saint Paul*, shows a decided affinity to this German tendency.

ally by more elaborate ideas which, through combinings and correctings of the documents, produce more complicated results, till the end is reached in the final editor's hands.

It is indeed significant that the starting suggestion of this documentary idea, in connection with the Synoptic Gospels, was made as early as the time of the Tübingen school, — in 1835 by Weisse, who may be considered, in a certain way, the originator of this method for the New Testament. But it was never taken up and carried through until Tübingen had finished its course. The suggestion was ahead of the times. The philosophy then was that which made only Tübingen possible. As a consequence it rested until evolutionary ideas opened the critical mind to its reception and its fuller and more developed treatment.¹ To

¹ This is really borne out by the history of documentary criticism in the Old Testament, for, while the first proposal of such criticism was made by Astruc in connection with his study of the Pentateuch, as early as 1753, and was taken up and developed by others who followed him, — notably Eichhorn (1780), Geddes (1800), De Wette (1806), and Ewald (1843), and found the first hint of its modern development form in Vatke (1835), an enthusiastic disciple of Hegel, it did not secure its large influence as a criticism until it was entered

be sure, the documentary method has freer swing in the Old Testament than in the New; but this is largely because the preponderance of historical writings in the Old Testament makes documentary partition there more of a possible, not to say more of a plausible thing. It is one thing to mark out the documentary growth of a narrative Book, with its original facts in its primary documents, and then the explanations and amplifications and complications of these facts in the following documentary growth; it is an entirely different thing to mark out the documentary growth of an Epistle and try to arrange a documentary chart of the development of its ideas. It has been attempted. This documentary spirit has come over from the Old Testament into the New, and has done more or less documentary work with almost all its epistolary writings, not to mention its narrative books; but it has been compelled, in its epistle documentation, to take such extraordinary positions, and has produced

into by such modern critics as Graf (1866) and Kuenen (1869) and Wellhausen (1878), the distinguishing idea with whom has been that the growth of the document is an indication of the development of Israel's religion.

such extraordinary results, that it has met with but an indifferent acceptance in the critical world.¹

Here then is the nexus between German criticism and German thought. What criticism England has she borrows largely from Germany. Yet, even in England, we see that her criticism, influenced as it is by these evolution ideas, is influenced also by her own metaphysical line of thinking. English critics admit the individuality of the Apostolic thinking and the presence and power of outside influences upon it; but they conform the teaching of the Epistles to the teaching of the Gospels, as the Germans do not, and to a larger extent

¹ The school is not large in its numbers. It may be said to have been begun in Holland by Loman's revival of Bruno Bauer's position in his *Quæstiones Paulinæ* (Theol. Tijdsch., 1882-1886), and in that country is best represented by Pierson and Naber in their *Verisimilia* (Amsterdam and Haag, 1886); in Germany by Steck in his *Der Galaterbrief nach seiner Echtheit untersucht* (Berlin, 1888), and Völter in his *Die Komposition der paulinischen Hauptbriefe* (Tübingen, 1890). The judgment passed upon the school by both German and English critics is severe (see Lindemann, *Die Echtheit der paulinischen Hauptbriefe*, Zürich, 1889; Gloël, *Die jüngste Kritik des Galaterbriefes*, Erlangen und Leipzig, 1890; Knowling, *The Witness of the Epistles*, London, 1892).

than the Germans, place behind both the supernatural; while, where the supernatural is antagonized, or its scope restricted, the conception of the supernatural in its relation to the natural is rather of this Neo-Hegelian type, than of the naturalistic type common among German Neo-Kantians.¹

Now, so much having been said regarding the present state of New Testament criticism and the philosophical conditions which stand behind it and influence and control its results, it becomes very clear that the point has been

¹ Evidences of this English criticism may be seen in Rainy, *The Development and Delivery of Christian Doctrine*, Edinburgh, 1874; Dale, *The Atonement*, London, 1888; Gore, *The Incarnation of the Son of God*, New York, 1891; Edward Caird, *The Evolution of Religion*, Glasgow, 1893; Fairbairn, *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology*, New York, 1893; Bruce, *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, New York, 1894; Charteris, Rainy, Orr, and Dods, *The Supernatural in Christianity*, Edinburgh, 1894²; Sanday, *Inspiration*, London, 1894; Forrest, *The Christ of History and of Experience*, Edinburgh, 1897; Somerville, *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, Edinburgh, 1897; Adeney, *The Theology of the New Testament*, New York, 1894.

William Mackintosh has reproduced in Scotland the more rationalistic phase of German criticism; in our country Orello Cone is reproducing a phase of this criticism which represents the Pfeiderer circle, and consequently more closely attaches itself to the Neo-Hegelian tendency in Great Britain.

reached where it must not only be admitted that this fundamental philosophy has to be reckoned with in the handling of present-day criticism, but where the question must be answered as to how far this development philosophy may have to be taken up and adopted in securing critical truth. Is Germany all wrong in this basal philosophy of hers? Is modern criticism all wrong in admitting it at all into its processes and allowing it at all to control and influence its points of view? Are documents an impossibility in and of themselves? Must the Synoptic Problem be solved *a priori* apart from written document sources? Must a possible travel document be kept out of the Book of Acts on principle? Must we refuse the influence of a primary Jewish Apocalypse or a Babylonian myth upon the Book of Revelation, whether or no? Is the impression of environment upon the Apostolic mode of thought out of the question? Is there no such thing as *Dogmengeschichte* in the Apostolic Church? Tübingen ignored the personality of the New Testament writers in order to emphasize the connection of their writings with the surround-

ing history. Must we, in spite of the death of Tübingen, still refuse to consider the personality of the writer, or to connect it with the historical development of which it may form a part? Tübingen held to a progress of Church history which accorded with its philosophic ideas of antithetic and synthetic growth. Now that this idea is given up, must we refuse to hold to any progress in the Church's history at all? Evolution works on the principle of deintegration and reintegration. Must we refuse to recognize any such development as possible in the Church's growth? These are vital questions. They must not only be asked; there must be an honest effort made to answer them.

In the direction of their answering, it must be admitted that there are no *a priori* reasons why we should deny the possibility of development in the Apostolic Church's life and thought. Such possibility must be freely acknowledged in the life and the thought of the Church generally; there is no reason why it should be denied in the life and the thought of the Apostolic Church, even though

that Church, in its thought and life, was under special divine control. If evolution generally can be theistic and yet be evolutionary, Apostolic development specifically can be inspirational and yet be developmental. There is nothing to prevent the divine mind conceiving and the divine will working out a plan which should be characterized by growth. We can think of a God as creating the world, and yet not find it impossible to think of him as developing his creation along lines of selection and survival of the fittest. We can think of a Christ in control of his specially inspired Church, and yet not find it impossible to think of him as developing that Church with a growth which would allow for an evolution, both of life and thought, from germinal beginnings to matured completion, and for influence of environment upon that evolution. God does not give up his control over the universe, nor over the Church, by the use of a plan in his controlling, and the plan of development is as possible of divine use as any other plan would be. It is simply a question as to whether the facts in the case point to its pres-

ence. We are not called upon indeed to enter on the discussion of its possible presence in the history of the universe, though we shall not be going very far astray if we assume such presence as proven, to a very large degree. The question before us however is its possible presence in the history of the Apostolic Church, — the history of its life and of its thought.

The Book of Acts gives us the history of this life of the Apostolic Church, and gives it in a very significant way. Suppose it be briefly stated. We may hold, without critical objection, that the author of the Third Gospel and the author of the Book of Acts are one and the same person, and that these two Books were written to and for the same reader, who was a Christian of the Gentile type.¹

¹ While the name Theophilus, from its composition, might easily lend itself to literary use, as the designation of a purely imaginary recipient of the writings addressed to him, its common usage among both Jews and Greeks would make it quite easily the name of an actual person, which is strongly confirmed by the title attached to it in the prologue of the Gospel, *κράτιστε*, — a title which, from the author's usage of it in Acts (23 : 26, 24 : 3, 26 : 25), would seem to indicate official rank. That this person was a Christian of Gentile

If this is so, then the relation between the purpose behind the writing of the Gospel and the writing of Acts is interesting. The Gospel was written evidently to give to this Gentile convert the facts in the life and death of this Jewish Jesus in whom he believed as the Redeemer of the world. He had been taught about him and he had believed in him on the basis of his needs of a Saviour for his soul. This Gospel was to instruct him more thoroughly in the earthly history of him in whom he had spiritually placed his trust. But there was a strange thing about the religion of this Jewish Christ, and this was that, almost as soon as his earthly mission was over and he had been received back into glory, — at least

origin seems almost necessary from the Gentile spirit of both the Gospel and the Book of Acts. Positive knowledge of this Theophilus however we do not possess. There is the statement in the Clementine Recognitions (10 : 71) that he was at the head of the men of influence in Antioch (*ita ut omni aviditatis desiderio Theophilus, qui erat cunctis potentibus in civitate sublimior, domus suæ ingentem basilicam ecclesiæ nomine consecraret*). With this ancient testimony may perhaps be in agreement the statement in the Apostolic Constitutions (7 : 46) which speaks of a Theophilus as the third Bishop of Cæsarea (*Καισαρείας δὲ τῆς Παλαιστίνης πρότερον μὲν Ζακχαῖος ὄποτε τελώνης, μεθ' ἃν Κορνήλιος, καὶ τρίτος Θεόφιλος*).

as soon as his religion began to go on its missionary way, — it left the Jewish people to which he had officially brought it and made its conquest of men's souls outside the Holy Land.

The Book of Acts is added therefore to the Gospel as a sequel to it, in order to show why this Gentile spread of Jesus's religion was the natural and the necessary thing, — why this religion could not have remained in Palestine and been the religion of Jesus, the Jewish Saviour of the world, — why it had to spread and become the universal religion it had shown itself to be. But this is shown by presenting the Church's life as a development carried on under the growth of the Pauline idea of justification by faith. There was the Jerusalem Church, under commission from its Risen Christ to go out as soon as it was endued with power from on high and be witness to its Lord unto the uttermost parts of the earth, — there it was, remaining strangely in its first home, with the idea that, somehow or other, this commission was to be fulfilled by preaching the Gospel in Jerusalem only, and converting

the world wholly through the gateway of the Christianized Jewish Church. It was a great preaching that this Church put forth, — bold and fearless; it was a successful preaching that it accomplished, — thousands were added to its numbers of those who had been its enemies and its bitter foes; but it was nevertheless a preaching which came short of the full duty of the Church, because it failed to comprehend the work which had been given the Church to do. So it was that the disciples were driven out of their home place by a persecution which scattered them everywhere preaching the Word. And so it was that a new Apostle was raised up to formulate and promulgate this basal mission idea of justification by faith as it had not been, and could not be, formulated and promulgated by the Jerusalem Apostles in their Jerusalem Church. This idea was present doubtless with all the Apostles from the beginning of their personal trust in Jesus as their Saviour, — though this Book of Acts does not say aught about it. It may have been given more or less prominent form in Peter's preaching in Jerusalem, in Paul's disputing with

the Grecians upon his return to the Holy City, in his first preaching and his after work with Barnabas in Antioch, though again as to this, the Book of Acts does not greatly enlighten its readers;¹ but it was in Paul's first mission tour through the churches of South Galatia that it makes plain that the Church became aware of the universal consequences which this idea was going to involve;² and so the conference at the Jerusalem Council followed, and the decision for toleration issued, and the missions spread, and the idea developed in fulness and grew in its possession of the Church, until the working centre of the Church shifted from Jerusalem to Rome.

This is what the Book of Acts places before the Theophilus to whom it was sent as an explanation of why the religion of Jesus, leaving the Jewish land, in which its Founder wrought his mission, and the Jewish people, to whom he officially came, spread out into a Gentile universalism, both of country and race. But it is evident that this is nothing more nor less than a development of church life under the

¹ Cf. Acts 2³⁸, 3¹⁶, 4¹², 5⁸¹, 9²⁹.

² Cf. Acts 13⁴⁶⁻⁴⁹, 14¹⁻⁷, 15¹¹.

growth of this idea of justification by faith. In saying this, of course, it is not meant that this idea was not essentially present in the Church from the beginning, — it certainly must have been in order to any real salvation through Jesus Christ, — but that it was not apprehended in all its fulness and was not carried out to its logical consequence in the Church's work. Nor is it meant that this idea, having once come into full working order in the Church, the Jerusalem ideas were thereupon cast out of all communion, — lost sight of and forgotten. There continued in the Apostolic Church a clearly understood and recognized and, in some respects, a perfectly unconscious duality of life and work.¹ Paul shows this in his Galatian statement of the harmonious outcome of the Jerusalem conference with the "Pillar Apostles," — "They gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision."² And it is seen, in its actuality,

¹ See Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, Cambridge and London, 1894, pp. 81-83. Jülicher, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Freiburg und Leipzig, 1894^{1&2}, S. 13.

² 2⁹f.

throughout the Book of Acts. It was indeed through Paulinism that this basal idea came to its full expression and became the accepted belief and life of the Church. But the Jewish idea of Christianity did not die at once; it did not wholly pass away throughout the Apostolic times; in fact, it was its development through the Judaizing party against which Paul made his doctrinal battle and over which he won his distinctive doctrinal victory. And it is clear further that, while it may be going too far to say that this was a development along the distinctive lines of evolutionary growth, — a development which started with unity and worked out in differentiations and came, at last, to a survival of the fittest ideas, — it will not be going too far to say it was a development which involved the distinctive principle of environment. Jerusalem could alone be the surrounding in which the undeveloped Christianity could do its work; the scattering of the Church, and the gradual establishment of a new centre in Antioch were the only conditions congenial to the development of the justification idea; while the progressive mis-

sion work, moving ever westward in its conquests, and so preparing for the final change of working centre to Rome itself, was an unfolding of the Church's life which alone made possible its world-wide work.

So much for the life of the Apostolic Church which is presented to us in the New Testament writings themselves. It is evident that, whatever else may be said about it, it is a life which admits, to a certain degree, of an evolution conception of its progress and of an evolution conception of its growth. Is this conception applicable also to the thought of the Apostolic Church as well as to its life?

Outside of informal statements of the Apostles' views on specific topics, such as we find Peter making at their gathering for the choice of a new Apostle,¹ or more formal statements, such as we find the Jerusalem Council making in its decree regarding the admission of the Gentiles into the Church,² we have nothing which might be called the distinctive creed of the Church of that age. At the same time however we have clear and definite statements

¹ Acts I 15-26.

² Acts 15 23-29.

of Apostolic teaching in the New Testament Books which form the record of that Church's life and thought, especially in the New Testament Epistles. And the statements which are the most comprehensive, both chronologically and systematically, are those which are found in the speeches and letters of the Apostle Paul. Is the fact of development and growth in any way present in the Church's thought as represented in Paul's theological ideas?

There are some facts which will command attention if Paul's Epistles be studied in the order of their writing. It will be evident, in the first place, that Paul's simpler Epistles are his earlier ones — as the Thessalonians — and his more complex Epistles are his later ones — as those of his first Roman imprisonment.¹ It

¹ Somerville, *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, pp. 151-155. Sieffert, *Die Entwicklungslinie der Paulinischen Gesetzeslehre*, *Theologische Studien*, Göttingen, 1897, S. 336. The dating of the Galatian Ep. cannot be certainly determined. In favor of its priority to the Cor. Epp. is urged, chiefly: (a) the Apostle's reminder that it was upon the former of two visits to them that he first preached to them the Gospel (4¹³, οἴδατε δὲ ὅτι δι' ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν τὸ πρότερον); (b) his statement that he is surprised that they are so soon changing to another Gospel from the one that he had preached to them (1⁶ Θαυμάζω ὅτι οὕτως ταχέως μετατίθεσθε

may indeed be said that this is merely due to the fact that the occasion which called forth

ἀπὸ τοῦ καλέσαντος ὑμᾶς ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον), making thus the composition of the Ep., on the basis of the South Galatian theory, not only before Paul's third mission tour, but soon after his second. The most likely occasion previous to the Cor. Epp. is that urged by Ramsay at the Syrian Antioch after the visit to Jerusalem which he made at the close of his second mission tour (St. Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen, New York, 1896, pp. 189-192), a later occasion than he had urged before (The Church in the Roman Empire, New York, 1893, pp. 101, 167).

At the same time, it must be admitted (a) that, for contextual reasons, *οὕτως ταχέως* (1⁶) is to be rendered rather "so rashly," and not "so soon;" (b) that, if the Ep. was written just immediately before another contemplated visit to the Galatians by the Apostle, it is strange that there is no specific reference to the plan he had in view (see the Apostle's custom in his other Epp., Rom. 15²⁵⁻²⁹, I Cor. 16⁵⁻⁹, II Cor. 12¹⁴ and 13¹⁰, in comparison with which note the inexpectancy of the Apostle's tone in Gal. 4^{19 f.}); (c) that the phrase *καὶ οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοί*, in the opening address (1²), cannot be well reconciled with a composition of the Ep. in any city where there was a Christian community. It indicates the conditions of a journey where the Apostle's natural reference is to the travel companions who were with him, rather than those of a city where his reference must be to the brethren with whom he was (see the term as used in Phil. 4²¹, where the reference is most likely to the Apostle's companions in his imprisonment as distinguished from the Christians generally in the city and those in Nero's household, v²²). These above conditions would seem to be best satisfied if the Epistle was written subsequently to the Cor. Epp., on the journey between Ephesus and Corinth previous to the Apostle's third visit to the latter

the Thessalonian Epistles was specifically a simpler one than that which called forth the city, — a journey which was of some months' duration, and not unlikely given, in a considerable part of it, to mission work (cf. Rom. 15¹⁷⁻²¹). The only reasonable objection to such a dating would seem to be in the expression τὸ πρότερον (Gal. 4¹³), as referring to the Apostle's first visit to Galatia. This objection however holds only if it be insisted that τὸ πρότερον must always refer definitely to the former of two, and can never refer generally to previous time, which would manifestly be against such N. T. passages as Jno. 6⁶², 7⁵⁰, 9⁸, Eph. 4²², I Tim. 1¹⁸, Heb. 4⁶, 7²⁷, 10³², I Pet. 1¹⁴ (see Buttmann, N. T. Grammar, Andover, 1880, p. 84; Jannaris, Historical Greek Grammar, London, 1897, § 514, with reference to such passages as Mk. 4^{31 f.}, Mt. 8¹², Lk. 21³, Eph. 3⁸). If, as Ramsay claims, the information upon which the Ep. is based is most naturally such as would come from a personal messenger, this messenger might have been Gaius of Derbe, who was one of Paul's companions when he left Corinth in the following spring (see Rendall, The Pauline Collection for the Saints, Expositor, Nov. 1893, p. 333). To all this is to be added the still larger argument that if, as McGiffert claims (A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age, New York, 1897, pp. 228 f.), the Apostle's experience in Galatia had made him careful to forewarn his European churches of similar troubles, it seems incredible, in view of the Judaizing character of the situation in the Corinthian community, at least by the time of II Cor. (cf. II Cor. 11^{4 f.}, 12-15, 21-23, 12^{11 f.}, and Bruce, St. Paul, Ch. IV.; also Ramsay, The Epistle to the Galatians, Expositor, July, 1898, pp. 494 f.), that nothing more should have been said about circumcision and the law in the Epp. to this church, if they were written after Gal. While it is difficult therefore to decide definitely upon a time for the writing of Gal., it would seem clear, from the above considerations, that the placing of it

letters to the Asian Churches; so that there is present in these Macedonian letters, not so much the Apostle's dialectic as his simple missionary preaching.¹ But this, in itself, goes far towards admitting that in these dozen years which intervened between Paul's first visit to Corinth and the close of his first imprisonment in Rome the Church's theological necessities had grown in complexity; that they were the simpler difficulties which first presented themselves to the Apostle's pastoral care, the more complicated ones that demanded his attention later. And if emphasis be laid upon the crudeness of the Thessalonian mind, and it be held that, should such another com-

before I Thess., either at Corinth during the Apostle's second mission tour (Zahn, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, Leipzig, 1897, S. 141; Rendall, *Expositor*, April, 1884, p. 164), or at Antioch before that journey began (McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 229), and so making it the first of Paul's extant Epistles, is not likely to be correct. (See, in general, Askwith, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, London, 1899. *Per contra*, Vernon Bartlet, *Pauline History and Chronology*, *Expositor*, Nov. 1899.)

¹ Holtzmann, *N. T. Theologie*, Bd. II. S. 207. Bruce, *St. Paul*, pp. 10-15. McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, pp. 147 f. Forrest, *The Christ of History and of Experience*, pp. 178 f. See also Weiss, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, Berlin, 1880³, S. 199 f.

munity have come across the Apostle's mission-way in his later work, he would have been compelled to write them very much the same sort of letter, even from among the midst of his more profound Epistles, the question is whether such a situation would have been possible in the Apostle's later work, even in the case of a newly missionized community, — whether the Apostle would not have known better, in his later life, how to guard his people against the possibilities of such crude mistakes regarding the end of the world and the non-participation of the Christian dead in the second coming of Christ, — whether the very development of the Church's life and work would not have made such mistakes unlikely. The Epistle to the Philippians may indeed be pointed to as an instance of a simpler letter written later in the Apostle's life, from beside more profound ones, — as Colossians and Ephesians, — and it may be said that it was due to the fact that there was a simpler situation at Philippi than there was at Ephesus and in the Lycus valley. This is doubtless true, but does this Philippian situation, sim-

ple as it may be, show no development in theological necessities upon that at Thessalonica; and is the Philippian Epistle, after all, no advance upon those to the Thessalonians? It would be very difficult to support such a contention. It is not claimed that there was no thought of the Judaistic controversy until the Corinthian and Galatian letters were written; since this controversy, in its primary stage at least, was the theme of the Jerusalem Council, and must have come into the Apostle's thinking before the Thessalonian Church was founded; the claim is that even this controversy had its place in the earlier life and work of the Apostolic Church, and that the troubles that came after it are not likely to have been so much repetitions of it as developments from it. There must surely have been an advance of thought and situation upon that of the Thessalonian and Galatian Churches which could have produced the elemental Gnosticism of the Western Asia Church, and made possible from Paul the Colossian and Ephesian letters.¹

¹ The interpretation of the Col. situation, which makes it one that involved nothing more than general shortcomings in

The former were troubles which belonged essentially to the Church's childhood and her

the people's practical religious life (v. Soden, Holtzmann'sche Hand-Commentar, Bd. III¹, S. 3-10. McGiffert, Apostolic Age, pp. 366-372. See also Hort, Judaistic Christianity, pp. 116-129) may point out a way of avoiding the critical difficulties which have been urged against an Apostolic origin for the Ep., and afford an easy defence for its Paulinity (McGiffert, Apostolic Age, pp. 372 f.), but we believe it does not sufficiently consider some of the passages in the Ep., e. g. (1) 2²⁰⁻²⁸, where there is disclosed an asceticism which is characterized by a severity towards the body (*ἀφειδία σώματος*) that would have its most natural explanation in a dualistic tendency of thought. This would be confirmed by the relative sentence v²², "all which forbidden things tend to produce destruction in their consumption" (*ἅ ἐστιν πάντα εἰς φθορὰν τῇ ἀποχρήσει*), if it be interpreted as Klöpffer suggests (Commentar, S. 65 f., 80), and as seems most in accord with the Greek usage of *εἰς* with the Acc. after *εἶναι* (Buttmann, N. T. Grammar, pp. 150 f.). (2) 2¹⁸, which shows the Errorists to be given to an angel-worship, in connection with which there would seem to be not merely visions (*ἃ ἔδρακεν ἐμβατεύων*), but a humility (*ταπεινοφροσύνη*), which, in its close connection with *θηρησκεία*, would best be understood as such a false shrinking from communion with God as led to a substitution of angel media. This seems to be the meaning also of the combination *ἐν ἐθελοθηρησκίᾳ καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ* (v²³) (see Abbott, Commentary; v. Soden, Commentar; Haupt, Kommentar, sub. loc.). (3) 2^{2f.}, 9f., 15, together with 1¹⁵⁻²⁰, in which are not only contained terms that most naturally remind us specifically of later developed Gnostic catchwords (*γνώσις, ἐπίγνωσις, μυστήριον, σοφία, πληρωμα*; see the different atmosphere of *γνώσις* and *σοφία* here from that which they have in Cors.), but where there seems to be present almost necessarily the idea of graded classes of

younger years; they came with the first flash of the facts of every-day life and of the first

supernatural powers which came afterwards to be characteristic of Gnosticism (*ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας* [2¹⁰] *ὅς ἐστιν . . . πρωτόκοκος πάσης κτίσεως, ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ ὄρατα καὶ ἀόρατα, εἴτε θρόνοι εἴτε κυριότητες εἴτε ἀρχαὶ εἴτε ἐξουσίαι* [1^{15f.}]). This idea would seem to be reproduced in Eph. 1²⁰⁻²³, which Ep. was written encyclically to the churches of the general region to which Colossæ belonged (see Abbott, Commentary; Lightfoot, Commentary; Haupt, Kommentar, sub] loc.). It is not claimed that it is a systematized Gnosticism that is controverted in this Ep. (such terms as *θανολογία, φιλοσοφία, ἐντάλματα, διδασκαλία, δογματίζεσθε* may have an elemental meaning, indicating merely that these errors had somewhat of an interrelated form, and were propagated in a dogmatic way); but in view of the fact that the acknowledged aim of Gnostic thinking was to assimilate Christianity and philosophy; in view also of the fact that this assimilation was made on the principle of eclecticism, so that Gnosticism did not take its [rise in any one school, nor, in fact, have any definite origin; in view further of the fact that the elements among which this syncretic process was carried on were Jewish, Pagan, and Christian,—the Jewish being furnished by thoughtful tendencies active in either Palestinian or Alexandrian Judaism, more probably the latter,—and that the general region to which this Col. community belonged was a recognized meeting-place for just these various forces, it would seem that the above passages are most naturally significant of something more serious than a mere lack of spiritual vigor on the part of the readers, and that the errors were not wholly confined to the practical sphere of ethics.

The vagueness of the ideas with which the Apostle seems

mission tour. The latter were troubles which came with the Church's more mature growth; they were not possible until there had been time for Jewish thought and Oriental speculation to work with the forms of truth which Christianity had to give. So there must have been an advance of thought and situation upon that of the Church at Corinth which could have produced the ecclesiasticism of this same Ephesian Church and of the Church in Crete, and made possible from Paul his Pastoral Epistles. The factional troubles of the Corinthian congregation may indeed have belonged to any Greek community; but they are not so likely to have come into the churches after Paul

to contend, and the absence of an extreme polemic on his part cannot be used against this conclusion; since the vagueness would indicate nothing more than that the Apostle was dealing with a very early phase of Gnostic thinking, before any systematization had taken place; while the Apostle's lack of severe polemic would be due to just this vague and uncertain condition of the trouble with which he had to deal.

The early dating of the Ep. suffers nothing from a higher critical consideration of the relation of the Ep.'s thought to the natural surroundings of its readers. This would rather show it to be an original source for the first beginnings of what developed later into the Gnostic system (see Haupt, *Kommentar*, S. 13-20; Abbott, *Commentary*, pp. xlvi-xlix; also McGiffert's admissions, *The Apostolic Age*, p. 369).

had pleaded for the spirit of Christian unity, as he did in his later life. On the other hand, the ecclesiastical tangles of the Asian and Cretan Churches are hardly possible in the earlier years of Apostolic Christianity. They belonged to the fuller growth of its later years, when the radiating centres had been developed and a more controlling organization of the Churches had become a necessity.

So it is that the simpler Epistles come first with Paul, the more complex later. The development of the Church's needs made the development of the Apostle's thought inevitable.¹

¹ The position we have taken is simply that, starting, as the Apostle evidently did, with the essentials of his theology, the experiences of his mission work brought these essentials into such new expression as to constitute, upon the whole, a development of his theology. This, we believe, is what we naturally would expect of any man, and may therefore naturally be held to have been the case with Paul, even though he had to do with supernatural revelations of truth. God reveals his truth, even to inspired men, in accordance with their nature, and it is man's nature to develop his understanding of the truth which comes to him. This is also what we believe Paul's Epistles reveal. Allowing, in every way, for the pure occasionalness of these writings, and the consequent absence from them of any premeditated plan of theological discussion, it seems to us clear that they show us such a development of situations in the Church's life and thought as would irresist-

There are confessedly significant questions involved in such a position. It can be asked, How are we to read the Apostle's letters? Do they give us all the theology the Apostle had at the time he wrote them,¹ or are they only partial expressions of a theology which

ibly bring the Apostle into a developed formulation of his theological ideas. It is doubtless true that Paul had, from the beginning of his Christian life, the essential idea of justification by faith; but it is a simple fact that the great controversy about this doctrine did not occur until after a preliminary development had taken place in the thought of the Church, and that the letters which have to do with it were not written until the controversy itself had been developed, especially in Galatia. So it is doubtless true that Paul had the essentials of his Christology from the vision on the Damascus road; but it is, at the same time, a fact that the great questions regarding this doctrine were not raised until late in the development of the Church's thought, and that the Epistles which have to do with these questions were not written at the beginning, but at the end, of the Apostle's ministry.

Here then we believe, is revealed a development in the Church's theological thought that brought about great controversies. What is claimed is merely that it is perfectly natural to believe that this development must have wrought something of a corresponding one in the formulation of the Apostle's theological thinking; so that it is something more than mere accident that brings his simpler letters first, his more complex letters last.

¹ See Clemen, *Chronologie der Paulinischen Briefe*, Halle, 1893, S. 53 f. W. Mackintosh, *The Christian Religion*, pp. 385 f., 392-394, 433 f.

he had substantially from the beginning?¹ Was he inspired with his complete Gospel in one revelation, — at the beginning of his Christian life;² or did it come to him as a process of thought at some period preceding his active work;³ or was it the slow growth which resulted from the pressure on him of the struggles and crises of his mission work,⁴ and did it, even then, move only along erratic lines?⁵ How much value is to be allowed his pre-Christian

¹ McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, pp. 147 f. Bruce, *St. Paul*, pp. 10-13, 46 f. Ellicott, *Commentary on Galatians*, London, 1867⁴ (1¹²). Forrest, *The Christ of History*, pp. 178 f. Holsten, *Das Evangelium des Paulus*, Vorwort. Cone, Paul, p. 179 note. Stevens, *The Theology of the New Testament*, New York, 1899, pp. 330 f.

² Reuss, *Histoire de la Théologie Chrétienne au Siècle Apostolique*, 2 vols., Strassburg, 1864³, Bk. IV. Alford, *The Greek Testament*, London, 1863-66, Vol. III. (*Gal.* 1¹²).

³ McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 148. Bruce, *St. Paul*, pp. 36 f., 45-47. Holsten, *Das Evangelium des Paulus*, Vorwort, Th. II S. 37, 50-52. Cone, Paul, Ch. III. Stevens, *New Testament Theology*, p. 330 f.

⁴ Sabatier, *The Apostle Paul*, pp. 2-13. Weiss, *The Pauline Epistles*, *AJT.* April, 1897, pp. 336 f.; see also his *Biblische Theologie*, S. 201-203. Matheson, *Spiritual Development of St. Paul*, London and Edinburgh, 1892⁸, pp. 166-196. Adeney, *Theology of the New Testament*, pp. 161-163.

⁵ Clemen, *Chronologie*, S. 256-275. W. Mackintosh, *The Christian Religion*, pp. 433 f.

development of thought? Did it prepare him to see the whole of his theology at once, in all its anti-legalism, all its Gentile universalism, all its Christological reach, all its adjustment with the Jew and its adjustment of the Gentile and the Jew within the Church;¹ or did it give him simply its germinal thought — sin, salvation, Christ — which his after work and life developed?² Did it condition his whole attitude of mind to the problems of thought and life he had to solve, so that his theology, after all, was merely another phase of Pharisaism;³ or did it furnish rather the natural sources for his religious thinking, so that his theology was Pharisaic only in the ideas from which it was revolutionized;⁴ or was its influence confined merely to the sug-

¹ Pfeiderer, *Paulinismus* (1890²), S. 30-33. Cone, *Paul*, Ch. III.

² Sabatier, *The Apostle Paul*, pp. 47-56, 71-76. Adeney, *Theology of the New Testament*, pp. 157-159. Bruce, *St. Paul*, pp. 36 f. W. Mackintosh, *The Christian Religion*, p. 379.

³ Pfeiderer, *Paulinismus*, S. 18-30. Holsten, *Zum Evangelium des Paulus und des Petrus*, S. 97, 113 f.

⁴ Sabatier, *The Apostle Paul*, p. 50. Adeney, *Theology of the New Testament*, p. 157. Cone stands somewhat between Pfeiderer and Sabatier at this point (*Paul*, pp. 10-21).

gesting of the outward form and fashion into which its dialectic was cast, so that his theology was Pharisaic simply in the matter of its intellectual dress?¹ What was the relation of Paul's theology to the teachings of Jesus? Was it supplemental to them, giving us such additions as alone enable us to understand the religion of Christ;² or was it simply interpretative of them, adding nothing to Christ's teachings, or, if adding anything, adding it so under the shadow of the Apostle's own idiosyncrasy of thought that there is no difficulty in detecting the addition and casting it aside?³

A generation ago there would be little question as to the general answer to be given to these queries; for the Apostle was considered as furnished with his whole theology from the beginning, putting it into the different forms presented in these Epistles simply as the occa-

¹ Weiss, *Biblische Theologie*, S. 195-197. Stevens, *New Testament Theology*, pp. 332-336 (more fully in his *Pauline Theology*, New York, 1892, pp. 58-74).

² Bernard, *Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament*, Am. ed., New York, 1867, pp. 103-126.

³ Wendt, *Die Lehre des Paulus*, S. 75-78. Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, Bd. I. S. 39-67, 88-99; *Grundriss*, Bd. I. S. 6-14. W. Mackintosh, *The Christian Religion*, p. 393.

sions which called them forth demanded. The matter of his pre-Christian environment and the development of his ideas under the pressure of the crises in his mission work was not seriously considered. And there was no hesitancy as to the indispensable place of his theology in the religion of Christ. Now there is also perhaps little question as to the answer to be given, but it is an answer of a different kind; for the Apostle is held to have been furnished only more or less with the beginnings of his Gospel. These were inherited from what he had been before his conversion, as well as revealed to him more or less supernaturally in his conversion, and were worked out in a more or less consistent development in the life which came to him as an Apostle; while his place in the Christian religion is a purely secondary and unessential one.¹

¹ Compare the views of such writers as Conybeare and Howson (*Life and Epistles of Paul*, London, Introduction and Ch. II. and III.), Lewin (*Life and Epistles of Paul*, London, 1890², Ch. XI.), Farrar (*Life and Work of St. Paul*, New York, 1889, Ch. I. and XI.) on the one side, with those of Harnack (*Dogmengeschichte*, Bd. I. S. 61-67), Pfeiderer (*Paulinismus*, 1890², *Einleitung*), and Holsten (*Das Evangelium des Paulus*, *Vorwort*) on the other.

Shall it be said that the view of to-day is an utterly impossible view, — that environment had no influence upon the Apostle's thinking, — that there was no development in what he thought, and that there is no differentiation between his place and Christ's in the establishment of the Christian religion? It is held that Paul was simply an interpreter of Christ, — a theologian like the men of to-day;¹ or, that, with the central point of his theology in the atonement, he interpreted it first not in the autosoteric way in which Jesus had proclaimed it, but in the directly contrary heterosoteric way, and then, finding the Antinomian dangers lurking in such an interpretation, he came back to a compromise with Jesus's view, and held it to be heterosoteric in its regenerative start and autosoteric in its sanctificate completion;² or even that his interpretation was not only different at the end of his work from what it was at the beginning, but that, during the work, it changed back and forth, time and again, with an erraticism which al-

¹ Harnack, *Grundriss*, Bd. I. S. 8.

² W. Mackintosh, *The Christian Religion*, pp. 386, 392-395, 397-403, 433.

most baffles one to keep its track.¹ Such views we may not be able to accept, but because these are not acceptable shall all views of their kind be refused? If this crude naturalism is, to our minds, incapable of proof, must we, along with it, deny all naturalism that studies Paul as a man, subject to such influences or surroundings as came upon other men, and dominated by such principles of growth as are common to men in general? From the Book of Acts and his own Epistles it seems as though there was an essential influence which Paul must have brought with him from his pre-Christian environment, in order to account for some of the peculiar forms and fashions of his thought; it seems as though there was an essential outline of his Gospel which he must have had from the beginning, in order not merely to be himself converted, but to have preached convertingly to others; it seems as though there was an essential development through which this outline must have gone, in order not merely to account for the difference of the Epistles, but to respond to the differ-

¹ Clemen, *Chronologie*, S. 256-275.

ence of the situation which his teaching must have held to that of Jesus, not only to account for the place of his writings in the Canon, but also for the influence of his thought upon the faith of the thinking and the living Christ. Critics to-day tell us, indeed, that Christ, and not Paul, was the originator of Christianity — which, undoubtedly, is true; they tell us that the overestimate of Paul's moulding power upon the Church's theology, which we often find, is due to the intense Gospel of the Reformation preaching and to the unbalanced ideas of the Tübingen school, — which also may be true; they tell us that, among the Apostolic Fathers and the early Apologists, there is to be found more of Johannine and Petrine than of Pauline impressions, — this too may be correct;¹ but the fact that Paul stands with Peter and John in influence upon the thought of the Church, even from these patristic times, — the fact that his writings, along with theirs, have

¹ See Mair, *Modern Overestimate of Paul's Relation to Christianity*, *Expositor*, Nov. 1897, pp. 289-305. Holtzmann, *N. T. Theologie*, S. 205 f. W. Mackintosh, *The Christian Religion*, pp. 392, 462. But see McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, pp. 149 f.

a place in the Church's Scriptures, — makes the Church, from its earlier age, give his teaching, along with theirs, a relation to that of Jesus which must in its view have been something more than that of a mere speculative theologian, however keen of insight and comprehensive of grasp he may have been. It would seem therefore as though we were compelled to come ourselves to a study of the teachings of Jesus and Paul, so as to ascertain, if possible, the relation between the teachers. This problem of the philosophy has, it seems to us, its most significant application just at this point. Will the principles of evolution, as this lecture has indicated it is possible to hold them regarding the phenomena of Apostolic life and thought, account for the relation between the teachings of Jesus and Paul? Will they make the relation intelligible? Will they show Paul to have been merely a near-by student of Jesus's message and work, conditioned by his pre-Christian environment and influenced by the crises of his mission work, aroused by the enthusiasms of his personal devotion to Christ, and stimulated by the spir-

itual activities of his mind; or an authoritative proclaimer of what this great Teacher himself intended his message and work to mean?

These questions are not likely to be determined in any series of lectures, — it is certainly not claimed that they are determined here; but it is possible that principles may be laid down through the following out of which some answer may be finally secured. Such principles it will be the purpose of the next two lectures to consider.

IV

COMPARISON OF THE TEACHINGS OF JESUS AND PAUL

IT is claimed to-day by critics who stand at the front of New Testament study that there was no such thing as a special inspiration which marked off the Apostles authoritatively from the rest of the early Christians. Not that the Holy Spirit was not active in the Apostolic Age, nor that the Apostles were not specially fitted to instruct the people in the truths of Christ's religion. The Spirit was active — miraculously active, if you will — in the *χαρίσματα*, but he was active indiscriminately among all the believers; while the Apostles' fitness to instruct came, not from any special unfolding to them of spiritual truth which isolated them in the infallibility and authority of their utterances, but from a personal power of intuitive insight into the spiritual truth common to the Church, — a power

which, while it was doubtless fostered by the Spirit, was subject to all the fallible difficulties which gathered round their humanity and gained its influence over the believers, as any man's power to interpret religious truth would gain it to-day, by its ability to make the truth it interpreted felt.¹

There is, of course, just one basis on which such a claim as this can be discussed, and this is the basis of the teachings of Christ and the Apostles themselves in the New Testament. It will not do for those who make the claim to appeal to Church history and say that theology began with the day of Pentecost, since no doctrine was authoritative save Christ's, and the Apostles were merely speculative theologians, like the dogmaticians of to-day;² for

¹ Wendt, *Die Norm des echten Christentums*, S. 29-33, 43, 47 f.; *Die Lehre des Paulus*, S. 1 f. McGiffert, *Primitive and Catholic Christianity* — Inaugural Address, New York, 1893, pp. 22 f., 33. Beyschlag, *Neutestamentliche Theologie*, Bd. I. S. 6-11, Bd. II. S. 17-19. Pfeleiderer, *Hibbert Lectures*, London and Edinburgh, 1885, pp. 1-16, 52 f., 86 f. Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, Bd. I. S. 44 f. Cone, *Gospel Criticism and Historical Christianity*, New York, 1891, pp. 35, 345 f.

² Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, Bd. I. S. 3, 8, 11-13. Wendt, *Die Norm des echten Christentums*, S. 41-44.

this is simply begging the question. It will not do to appeal to patristics and say that the Fathers held themselves as much inspired as the Apostles, and if they saw no difference, it is not for us to create it;¹ for, even granting this were the position which the Fathers held, — as few students will be able to admit that it was, — such a method would be, after all, allowing outside opinion to take the place of personal claims, and this is a method which is not likely to lead to the truth. It will not do even to appeal to philosophy and say that the Apostles were subjects of environment and education; that Paul was a Pharisee before he was a Christian, and brought his Pharisaic theology into his converted life;² for this is not the point at issue. No one is going to deny environment and education their place in the Apostolic life, any more than one would deny a development of that life itself. Paul was a Pharisee before he was a Christian, and his Pharisaic life and training had its effect upon

¹ McGiffert, Inaugural Address, pp. 22 f.

² Pfeleiderer, Hibbert Lectures, pp. 47 f., 201 f. Wendt, *Die Lehre des Paulus*, S. 76 f.

his later thought; but the question is whether, along with all this, there are claims which Paul makes for his Gospel which can be ignored when we come to the discussion of this Gospel's authoritative inspiration. In other words, the question as to whether these thinkers are right or wrong must depend upon a careful consideration of what Christ teaches regarding the Apostles, as reported to us in the Gospels, and of what the Apostles say of themselves, as laid before us in their Epistles. There must be an impartial study of the New Testament statements bearing on the question.

Curiously enough however these critics do not object to this basis of discussion. They are willing to go to the Gospels and to the Epistles, and take up their statements and give them study; but they say there is an important distinction to be made in studying them. They are willing to admit, for instance, that Paul claims his Gospel to be infallibly authoritative; but they say, not only does Christ not guarantee to the Apostles the infallible authority Paul claims for himself, but this Apostolic claim shows itself to be exaggerated; and when

we ask how it does they say, by the differences from the Gospel of Jesus which Paul's Gospel itself discloses, — differences in some points so essential that they mark the Apostle's teachings as being outside of any right to be a divine authority for our faith. They do not object to saying that Paul and Jesus agree in what might be called the main substance of their theologies, that their foundation views are very generally the same; but they hold that, from these common beginnings, Paul has developed his Gospel with such an arbitrary infusion of personal ideas and opinions, with such an overwhelming trend of personal thought, as to throw it out of the possibility of being considered a genuine development of Jesus' teachings, and so necessarily out of the possibility of an unreserved acceptance on our part.¹

In view of this position of advanced criticism to-day, it becomes very interesting, and most important, to consider the results which a comparison of the teachings of Paul and Jesus really produces. On the situation, as represented by

¹ Wendt, *Die Lehre des Paulus*, S. 11, 75-77.

this Apostle to the Gentiles, the emphasis of the critics rests, and so, with this situation, naturally stands or falls the whole relationship between the Apostolic teaching generally and that of Christ.

We confine ourselves therefore to a comparison between Jesus and Paul. If this comparison brings us face to face with such differences as will allow the belief that the Apostle's thought, in a perfectly true and natural way, holds itself in developed line with that of Jesus, then it would seem as though the authority of the Apostle's Gospel must be fully recognized. We may admit development within Paul's thinking, and yet receive Paul's claim of a divine authority for his thought. The two things may go together. However supernatural we may understand inspiration to be, we may not understand by it anything that divorces a man from himself and the laws that govern the processes of his mind. So we may admit a development of Paul's thinking from that of Christ's, and yet hold Paul's claim of authoritative inspiration for his own theology. Paul's truths may have come to him from God,

and yet have come to him in stages which were developmental from the teachings of Christ, as they continued to come in stages which were developmental within themselves. The vision on the way to Damascus may have been an objective, supernatural event; the great truth of Jesus's Messiahship given in this vision may have been a truth of absolute revelation; this initial truth may have been followed by others of like revelatory kind, given in equally supernatural ways, and yet there have been in the whole experience a developmental element which not only made Paul's theology a progressive thing within itself, but a progressive thing on from Christ's own teachings. The world by wisdom may not have been able to find out God, yet God did not need to make the revelation of himself rationally erratic in order to make it above reason's self-production.

If however this comparison presents to us such differences as will not permit this belief of a true and natural development from Jesus to Paul; if it shows us an arbitrary infusion by Paul of ideas and views which are foreign to Christ's thought, — that have their source in

Paul's Pharisaism or in his pagan philosophical surroundings, rather than in Jesus's teaching, and that lead Paul's thinking away from Christ's, so that in the end his Gospel stands out of harmony with the Master's, — then Paul's claim of divine authority for his Gospel must be given up. We cannot admit Paul's thinking to have been out of concord with Jesus's teaching, and yet believe him when he says his Gospel came to him by revelation from above. Truth cannot be out of agreement with itself and still be true. Paul cannot teach a Gospel which shows itself to be a distortion of Jesus's Gospel and be authoritative in what he teaches.¹

The discussion thus would seem to gather around the single question, as to whether Paul's Gospel is such a development from that of Jesus as to lead to an essential agreement with it in its results. Our task consequently stands very clearly before us. It is not to discover whether there are differences in Paul's teachings from those of Jesus; for differences there must be in the teachings, unless we propose to ignore all differences in the teachers.

¹ Wendt, *Die Norm des echten Christentums*, S. 33, 36

It is not to discover whether these differences are the result of development; for Christ standing, as he does, at the beginning, and Paul standing, as he does, at the close, it is hardly possible that the differences between them should not be due to development, as well as to the men themselves. The task is rather to discover what sort of development has taken place, — whether it is, so to speak, a purely arbitrary development, in which Paul may indeed have taken leading ideas presented by Christ, but have handled them in such a Pharisaic, such a pagan, such a purely speculative and scholastic way that, though what he produced may have been developed from what Christ began, it holds no relationship to it after the development is over; or whether the development from which these differences come is one that leads along the line of an essential harmony with Christ, — in other words, whether the differences which we find between Paul and Christ are due to a development that is out of line or in line with Christ.

I. In this task, which necessarily must be limited in its scope by the necessities of these

lectures, the doctrine which first presents itself to our consideration is that which may be designated the doctrine concerning the *relation of man to God*. This is a term which represents a general group of statements concerning man's condition outside of and within the Kingdom of God, and might perhaps be more accurately divided along this line of the Kingdom's membership. But what is lost in accuracy is gained in impression; for by this grouping we secure a more definite view of where Paul's thinking regarding general salvation matters stands as related to that of Christ.

But when we take up this group it seems as though we had, at the very outset, come upon a radical difference between the Master and his Apostle; for Christ appears to make the relation between man and God one of nature, while Paul seems to make it one of law. Jesus seems to have come into his ministry with a vital conviction of his unique relation of Sonship to God. Indeed we see it, even before his ministry began, in his boyhood's rebuke to his parents as they found him in the temple among the doctors of the law: "How is it

that ye sought me? wist ye not that I must be in my Father's house and busy about my Father's affairs?"¹ Its presence, as the controlling conviction with him, seems to be implied in the tempter's testing propositions in the wilderness: "If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones become bread; cast thyself from the temple's pinnacle; fall down and worship me,"²—propositions that would not have been made had it not been known what he knew himself to be, and propositions that are upheld by him in all the dignity and realness of their meaning; so that it is perfectly natural, when he comes in his first Jerusalem visit to the cleansing of the temple, that he should say, plainly and distinctly: "Make not my Father's house an house of merchandise."³ All this is at the beginning of his work, and the Fourth Gospel shows how it continued to be the same until his work was over.⁴

Now this idea of Sonship Jesus seems to have carried over into the relationship of his

¹ Lk. 2 49.

² Mt. 4 8-11; Lk. 4 8-13.

³ Jno. 2 16.

⁴ See Forrest's able presentation of Christ's consciousness of his divine Sonship, *The Christ of History*, Lects. I.-III.

disciples to God, so that God is placed before them as their Father. Read the Sermon on the Mount and see how this Father character of God runs through it from beginning to end,¹ and then, at the other end of his ministry, take up his valedictory address to his disciples, and see how it constitutes the basis also of that;² until, upon the resurrection morn, he can say to Mary: "Go unto my brethren, and say to them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God."³ And this Fatherhood of God Jesus seems to have extended generally to men; so that when he talks to the Samaritan woman he says to her: "Woman, believe me, the hour cometh when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father. Ye worship that which ye know not: we worship that which we know: for salvation is from the Jews. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth: for such doth the Father seek to be his worshippers,"⁴ as though this were an

¹ Mt. 5-7; Lk. 6.

³ Jno. 20¹⁷.

² Jno. 14-17.

⁴ Jno. 4²¹⁻²³.

absolute relation which God sustained generally to men. It is true that, according to Jesus's teaching, those who are his disciples enter into this relationship, as those who are not his disciples do not,¹ — just as the Prodigal Son entered into his Father's relationship to him, when he came to himself, as he had not done when he departed into a far country.² Indeed, according to Jesus, the world denies this relationship, and acts towards the Son practically as though the relationship did not exist. "If God were your Father," Jesus said to the boasting and unbelieving Jews, "ye would love me."³ But, just as all the time the Prodigal was in the far country he was still the Son, and the heart that yearned for him at home was the Father's heart, so the relationship of Father and Son exists, in this absolute sense, between God and man generally, though it is only as we acknowledge it, by coming into the Kingdom, that we understand and enjoy it. This, at least, the teaching of Jesus would seem to imply. Jesus's idea therefore of the relation between God and man

¹ Mt. 11 27.² Lk. 15 11-19.³ Jno. 8 42.

seems to be one of nature, though man's nature has to be regenerated before it can discover itself. "Except a man be born anew — from above — he cannot see the Kingdom of God," — cannot come into an understanding of this filial relation to God.¹

Over against this, Paul has given us an entirely new idea, which seems to be utterly foreign to the teachings of Christ, — the idea that the relationship between God and man is one of law. It is quite true that the idea of Fatherhood and Sonship is not absent from the teachings of Paul. It is perhaps not as frequent with him as it is with Christ, but it is there, and there in as general a way as with Christ.² To Paul, as to Jesus, God is the Father of him who believes, and the believer is God's child. "For ye received not the spirit of bondage again unto fear," he writes to the Romans, "but ye received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit,

¹ Jno. 3^s.

² See Mead, *The Fatherhood of God*, AJT, July, 1897, pp. 588-590, 595.

that we are children of God.”¹ To Paul, as really as to Jesus, God can be said to be the Father of all men. “I bow my knees unto the Father, from which every family in heaven and on earth is named.”² But, granting this, granting even that Paul may be said to use the term “Father” in the absolute sense, and so extend the Fatherhood of God generally over mankind, — granting this all, — it is clear that to Paul there seems to have been one great fact, — the law of God. This fact is present with all men, — with the Jew in the written enactments of Sinai;³ with the Gentile in the convictions and consciousness of the heart.⁴ The keeping or breaking of this law determines man’s moral status before God. If he keeps it, he is righteous; if he fails to keep it, he is a sinner.⁵ And this moral status carries its own consequences with it. God will render to every man according to his deeds, — to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile. The doers of the law shall be justified in God’s sight, and

¹ Rom. 8¹⁶ f.,

² Eph. 3¹⁴ f.,

³ Rom. 2¹⁷ f., 3¹, 9⁴.

⁴ Rom. 2¹⁴⁻¹⁶.

⁵ Rom. 2⁶⁻¹³, 25-27, 4⁴, 10⁵; Gal. 3¹².

those who sin against the law shall perish under its judgment. And this condition of affairs is not essentially altered by an entrance into the Kingdom of Christ. This Kingdom is not a lawless Kingdom. The fact of the law is present there, just as it is present outside in the world. The only difference is that with men outside its keeping is impossible. Jews and Gentiles show this by the startling record they have made in their attempt to compass it.¹ In fact, the written law was given the Jew in order to make evident, by his impotency in its keeping, even under the most favorable circumstances, how helpless men are in the matter of making themselves just with God, and consequently how they need to come to Christ.² This constant and universal breaking of the law, written and unwritten, rests as a curse upon mankind.³ But this curse has been removed by the death of Christ;⁴ so that men come now into a new legal relation to God, which is forensic and not actual, by which men are treated as righ-

¹ Rom. 1, 2.

² Gal. 3¹⁹⁻²⁴; Rom. 4¹⁵, 5²⁰, 7⁸⁻¹³.

³ Gal. 3¹⁰.

⁴ Gal. 3^{13 f.}

teous in God's sight, although they are sinners,¹ and so are received into a fellowship with him, in which they have given to them a spiritual power that brings them into a keeping of God's fundamental moral law, as revealed in the great principles of the decalogue, — a keeping of this law that would not otherwise be possible.²

There can be no question that this is most decidedly a law conception of things, and a conception which evidently has no counterpart in the teachings of Christ. What is its explanation? The answer is quickly made that its explanation lies in the pre-Christian Pharisaism of Paul. The law of God, it is said, had been the great thing with Paul in all his former life. For him it had represented the whole relation of man to God. It continued to do so now in his Christian life, only the fact of Christ had come in to change its bearing upon man's salvation. His own experience with the law had been a very vivid one. It still continued to be. He simply transfers his own experience

¹ Rom. 5¹⁹; II Cor. 5²¹.

² Rom. 8⁴, 29; Eph. 1⁴, 2¹⁰, 19²¹, 4²⁴; Tit. 2¹⁴.

and makes it good for men generally. We can see therefore, it is urged, how natural it is that Paul should treat the plan of salvation in such a legal way, and how sincere he was in the treating; but, however sincere and natural such treatment was, it was out of all agreement with Christ; for Jesus was not only not a Pharisee, but stood in strong opposition to this very legal view of things which the Pharisees entertained. He denounced their legalism in unsparing terms, and could not, in consistency with himself, have entertained in his teaching even the modification of it which Paul introduced. There is therefore, it is claimed, hopeless discord here, — fundamental, fatal. Paul's teaching must be considered the arbitrary product of his individualism, and in no way a mere development of Christ's ideas.¹ If this is so, it is a serious condition of things. Is it so?

In answering this question there are one or two things to be noted which will quite seri-

¹ Wendt, *Die Lehre des Paulus*, S. 26 f., 30 f., 36. Pfeiderer, *Paulinismus*, Einleitung, S. 1-33. Holtzmann, *Neutestamentliche Theologie*, Bd. II. S. 203 f. Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, Bd. I. S. 15-17. *

ously affect the answer when it is made. The first thing is that Paul denounces the legalism of the Pharisees just as strongly as does Christ. Take the second chapter of Romans and place it alongside of the twenty-third chapter of Matthew, and see if there is much difference in their spirit after all. Both are directed against the Jew, who made the law his religion and boasted that his outward adherence to it secured to him acceptance with God. Both are aimed against the pride and prejudice and hypocrisy and utter demoralization that resulted from such a position. The legalism that Christ denounces therefore is not the legalism which is taught by Paul. Paul emphasizes the law element in man's relation to God, but he does not make it the basis of salvation. No one of all the Apostles so strongly opposes such a claim as does Paul.¹ He looks at the heart's right condition, and its right control over character and life. He holds, as Christ does, the need of something more than man's mere culture of himself. If the Sermon on the Mount stands for the spirit of religion over

¹ Rom. 3^{19 f.}, 27^{f.}, 4²; Gal. 2¹⁶, 3^{11 f.}; Eph. 2^{8 f.}; II Tim. 1⁹.

against its false legalism, then Paul stands with that when he says: "For neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature."¹ If Jesus declares that the Kingdom of God, the Kingdom of the true Spirit of religion, of true character and life, is possible only through the new creation of the Holy Ghost, then Paul stands with him when he says: "According to his mercy he saved us, through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost."² On this point of false legalism and true spirit Paul and Christ stand together.

But, more than this, not only is the legalism which Christ denounces not the legalism of Paul, but Christ holds, in essence, to the very legal element in man's relations to God, which Paul so strongly emphasizes and so profoundly carries out. Recall the incident in the Gospel history where the lawyer comes to Jesus with his tempting question about securing eternal life.³ Jesus answers it by asking him another question: What it was that the law itself, which he professed to interpret and to teach, taught

¹ Gal. 6¹⁶.

² Tit. 3⁵.

³ Lk. 10²⁵⁻³⁷.

him as necessary to do. This question the lawyer answers by summing up, doubtless as he had often heard Jesus himself do, the heart of the Old Testament teaching: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself." And Jesus said to him: "Thou hast answered right: this do and thou shalt live." On the basis of the law and its works this was the way to secure eternal life. The law was God's revealed will. To that will man stood obligated. Let him do it, fully and completely, and he should be accepted of God. God stood pledged before the universe for that. Recall further the incident when the ruler came to Jesus with the same absorbing question about eternal life, only wording it: "Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life?"¹ And he said unto him, Why askest thou me concerning that which is good? One there is who is good: but if thou wouldest enter into life, keep the commandments." Man did, after all, stand in legal relation to God; if

¹ Mk. 10¹⁷⁻²²; Mt. 19¹⁶⁻²²; Lk. 18¹⁸⁻²³.

he would fulfil that relation, there would be no question about the issue, — he should live.¹ Is this, in essence, different from Paul's position that man stood in a law relation to God which, if he could carry it out, would bring him salvation?² See further how, all through his teaching, Jesus leaves no doubt that, on this present basis of the law on which men around him stood, there was no other outcome but death. As men were then keeping the commandments, as men were then loving God and their neighbor, there was no hope of salvation. There was need of an entirely new condition of things, which was not a release of man from law, but a regeneration of man into new living. Is this, in essence, different from Paul's position that man could not accomplish eternal life

¹ Such perfect keeping of the law would not indeed involve any self-conscious merit, as Forrest has shown; since the perfection of its keeping includes the spirit in which it is kept, and this must be one of conscious dependence upon God as the source of all moral good. At the same time however, in the light of these Gospel statements, the perfect keeping of the law must have its result in eternal life. This Forrest seems to have overlooked. See *The Christ of History*, Lecture VII.

² Gal. 3²¹.

on the present law basis of things; that a revolution was necessary, — not a revolution of release from law, but a revolution of transforming into new living? Far from this being the case, the point of all this investigation really becomes, not as to why Paul enters into this legal relation of man to God as he does, but why Christ does not enter into it as Paul does. He had it there in essence, why did he not carry it out? Why did he not show how the law relation of those inside the Kingdom differed from the law relation of those outside the Kingdom? Why did he not make clear how it was that the law was removed, in its curse of punishment and its burden of ceremonial requirement, and yet left, in its essence of moral obligation for all time? Why did he not bring out the mystery of this forensic status into which we are brought by our faith in him? These were the great points in Paul's development of the doctrine; why did not Jesus develop it at these points himself? He had the fact of law and man's relation to it outside the Kingdom; he had the ideal relation to it that man was to hold within the Kingdom;

why did he not unfold and explain the change from the one to the other? This is, in reality, what Paul has done; how does it happen that Jesus has failed to do it?

The answer to this, it seems to me, is not difficult to give. It lies in the very plain fact that the change in man's relation to the law, from without to within the Kingdom, was due to the death of Christ himself, and it was impossible for Christ to explain and unfold the effects of his death before his death had taken place.

That Christ recognized that his death would have an effect upon man's relation to God's law, would, in fact, change that relation, so as to deliver man out of the condemnation into which his breaking of the law had brought him and place him in a position of freedom from its punishment, there can be no question, if we read what Christ himself has said: "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many."¹ "This is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many unto remission of

¹ Mk. 10⁴⁵.

sins.”¹ Here is at least the outline of the law effects of his death statement, which hint along the legal lines that Paul has followed out. But when we remember how hard it was for Christ to bring his disciples to realize the coming fact of his death, how difficult it was for him to persuade them that he must die at all, we cannot be surprised that he would hesitate to fill this outline out, and enter into a doctrinal discussion of the legal changes by which “ransom” and “remission” would be brought about. It was simply impossible that he should do so. Much as critics imply that, if Paul’s doctrine is to be accepted, Christ was at fault in not making his teaching as full as Paul’s, they would be the first to discover and criticise the anachronism that would then have been involved. Such teaching would have had little or no meaning for the disciples. It would have been to them more than foolishness. See how his discourse in the synagogue at Capernaum was misunderstood. Those were wonderful words: “I am the living bread which came down out of heaven: if any man eat of this

¹ Mt. 26²⁸.

bread, he shall live forever: yea, and the bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world.”¹ And yet the Jews, instead of reaching up to the height of this sacrificial idea, strove among themselves and said: “How can this man give us his flesh to eat?”² And, although Jesus went on to elaborate what he had said, the disciples themselves confessed: “This is a hard saying; who can hear it?”³ See further how, when Christ does come to speak in plain terms of his death, it is only late in his teaching, not because it was not clear to his mind earlier, but because it was only after his disciples had come to the conviction of his Messiahship, that they could be prepared to entertain the fact of his death. And yet, even with this preparation, they could not receive it. In fact, it simply accentuated the difference between their idea of the Messiah and Christ’s.⁴ And, even after the death had taken place, they could with difficulty

¹ Jno. 6⁵¹.

² v 52.

³ v 60.

⁴ See Fairbairn, *Christ's Attitude to his own Death*, Expositor, Oct. 1896, pp. 283-288; Dec. 1896, pp. 415 f. See also Gilbert, *The Revelation of Jesus*, New York, 1899, pp. 251 f.

understand what it meant. Jesus himself had to unfold to them its necessity out of the familiar teachings of the law and the prophets, before they could be reconciled to its agreement with the character of the Christ, and, through vision and providence and the insistent pressure of events in their Apostolic work, it had to be forced home upon their understanding, before they could be brought to comprehend its practical bearing upon man's relation to the law of God and its consequent meaning for the universality of the plan of salvation.

Would it have been worth while for Christ to try to discuss these things, before his disciples understood that his work was in any way to involve such an event as Calvary? I think it is too much to ask, if we are really going to recognize that there was anything in the shape of evolution working in the history of those Gospel and Apostolic days. But take Christ's germinal teachings as they stand, place after them his death, and follow this up with all his practical teaching and training of the Church into an understanding of the bearing of his death upon the universality of Christianity,

upon the justification of the Jew as well as of the Gentile, upon the fundamental relation of man to God's law, and Paul's teaching regarding man's law relation to God, its change from without to within the Kingdom through the vicarious death of Christ, and the forensic justification of those who trust in him becomes perfectly natural, not as an arbitrary infusion of Pharisaic ideas, out of all harmony with Christ, but as a profound development of Christ's own teaching through the light shed by Old Testament law and prophecy upon the actual fact of his death,¹ — a development which holds itself fully in line with Christ. Had Paul stood with Jesus before this death occurred, it might be difficult to escape the charge of an unnecessary intellectualism on his part; just as it would have been hard to escape it had

¹ There is no disposition in this statement to ignore the element of personal experience behind the Apostolic teaching which Somerville so emphasizes (*Paul's Conception of Christ*, pp. 14-17). This was a necessary source of Paul's teaching, as well as of that of all the Apostles; but experience implies just this very background of facts which stood historically behind the Apostles — Paul as well as the rest — and made the experience possible. See Forrest, *The Christ of History*, pp. 329 f.

Jesus himself so filled out his own teaching.¹ But standing, as he does, after the death, it becomes difficult to keep ourselves from the conviction that his teaching is a necessary development of Christ's. If it is not such a development, then we must be prepared to say that Christ's statements about his death were all the Church needed to know, finally and authoritatively, regarding its effect upon this question of man's relation to God. This is indeed Watson's affirmed position.² But if we listen to those who have interpreted the two

¹ Christ's purpose in his teaching was not so much to instruct men regarding the Kingdom as to bring men within it, and this bringing of men within the Kingdom was accomplished through the revelation to them of his personality. We can consequently understand of how small significance is the fullness of his teaching about his death, — how, in fact, it was its germinal character which was necessary in order to bring the truth suggestively to their intelligence, and rouse them to a discovery of the person who stood behind it. On the other hand, if Jesus's whole purpose had been to fill his disciples full of his teachings as final truths, then the utter demoralization of the disciple band at the crucifixion would be proof that his purpose had completely failed. See Forrest, *The Christ of History*, pp. 108-114, 133 f.; also Somerville, *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, p. 10.

² *The Mind of the Master*, pp. 33 f. See also, in general, Gilbert, *The Revelation of Jesus*, pp. 306-308; on the other hand, see Somerville, *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, p. 237.

principal statements of Christ regarding the purpose of his death, independently of Paul's declaration of the vicarious nature of that death and its consequent satisfying of the claims of the law, we can easily understand how necessary the Apostle's statements are to their proper comprehending.¹

It is not at all to the point to object that, if this was a necessary development of Christ's teaching, it is hard to understand why the Jerusalem Apostles did not develop it before Paul; for their mission to the Jerusalem and Judean Jews made them concerned primarily with the question of Jesus's Messiahship, which they proved more from his resurrection and his ascension than from his death. Had they been

¹ See Wendt, *Die Lehre des Paulus*, S. 56 f. Holtzmann, *Neutestamentliche Theologie*, Bd. I. S. 292-304. Spitta, *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristentums*, Göttingen, 1893, Bd. I. S. 284-288. Beyschlag, *Neutestamentliche Theologie*, Bd. I. S. 153. Holsten, *Zum Evangelium des Paulus und des Petrus*, S. 172 f., 183 f. Pfeiderer, *Urchristentum*, S. 395. Jülicher, *Theologische Abhandlungen (Weizsäcker-Festschrift)*, Freiburg, 1892, S. 241. v. Soden, *Theologische Abhandlungen*, S. 144. Fairbairn, *Expositor*, Dec. 1896, pp. 423-426; Jan. 1897, pp. 25-30. Watson, *The Mind of the Master*, pp. 33 f. Gilbert, *The Revelation of Jesus*, pp. 262-266, 274-276.

thrown into the extra-Judean world and been compelled to deal with the question of Christ's Saviourship rather than his Messiahship, they would have come necessarily to the discussion of man's justification through him, and so come naturally into a development of the doctrine of his death. We can see, for example, how Peter's position changes when the practical question of Gentile salvation comes before him in the Jerusalem Council.¹ We can see his growth of view, from his first vision of the problem on the housetop at Joppa² and his first discussion of it before Cornelius and his household at Cæsarea;³ while his first Epistle shows how the necessities of his work among the Gentiles brought him even more fully into a treatment of the theme.⁴ It is simply another case of the evolution of events, and none should be so quick to recognize and appreciate it as those who apply so relentlessly to Biblical criticism the evolution philosophy.⁵

¹ Acts 15^{9, 11}.

² Acts 10¹³⁻¹⁷.

³ Acts 10^{28, 34-43}.

⁴ I Pet. 1^{2, 18 f.}, 2²⁴, 3¹⁸, 4¹.

⁵ We fail sometimes to remember that Paul's teaching possesses a peculiar fullness from the fact that it is a presentation of the totality of Christ's self-manifestation; whereas

II. Now the significance of all that has been said is most strongly confirmed when we consider that the other differences between the teachings of Christ and Paul, which are urged upon us to-day, are explained and adjusted in this same manner. The position which we have taken would be of force were this the only difference which could be so treated; but this is not the fact. Throughout these two great teachings runs the presence of an essential unity between them, together with an apparent difference, at times so apparent as to be difficult of understanding, even suggestive of personal arbitrariness of view on the Apostle's part, and yet a difference which shows itself to be comprehensible, natural, necessary even, when there is taken into consideration this evolution progress of events. We have seen it in this doctrine of the relation of man to God. We see it further in the doctrine of *the* Christ's own teaching was, in itself, but a part of that self-manifestation,—or, as Forrest has tersely expressed it in referring to what Alexander Knox has said: "The mediatory truths receive a formal and explicit expression in Paul, which is not found in the Gospels, for the obvious reason that the mediation was then in progress." (*The Christ of History*, pp. 274 f., 332 f.)

condition of salvation which stands so nearly related to it.

With Jesus and with Paul the condition of salvation is essentially faith, — a faith which centres itself in Christ. Jesus makes this very plain in his conversation with Nicodemus: “As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth may in him have eternal life.”¹ He makes this plain also in that spiritual discourse to the Jews and his disciples in the Capernaum synagogue, difficult though that discourse was to understand in itself: “Work not for the meat that perisheth,” Jesus said, “but for the meat which abideth unto eternal life, which the Son of man shall give unto you; for him the Father, even God, hath sealed.”² That was the work God wanted them to do; but they, ignorant of his meaning, answered: “What must we do, that we may work the works of God? Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent. . . . I am the

¹ Jno. 3¹⁴.

² Jno. 6²⁷.

bread of life: he that cometh to me shall not hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst. . . . This is the will of my Father, that every one that beholdeth the Son, and believeth on him, should have eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.”¹ He makes this plain also to the people at Jerusalem, at the close of his ministry: “While ye have the light, believe on the light, that ye may become sons of light. . . . I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on me may not abide in darkness.”² And Paul makes very plain, in his Epistles, the same condition: “Ye are all sons of God,” he says to the Galatians, — “sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus.”³ He shows the Romans that both Jews and Gentiles are practically under condemnation of God’s law and have no possibility of a righteousness in God’s sight: “But now apart from the law a righteousness of God hath been manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ unto all them that believe; for

¹ v. 23 f., 85, 40.

² Jno. 12^{38, 46}.

³ Gal. 3²⁶.

there is no distinction; for all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, by his blood, to show his righteousness, because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God; for the showing, I say, of his righteousness at this present season: that he might himself be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus."¹ And so, in placing before the Philippians his spiritual life, he says his ambition is to "gain Christ, and be found in him, not having a righteousness of my own, even that which is of the law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith."²

At the same time however it cannot but be evident that the Christ on whom this faith is to rest is, with Jesus, the one who came into the world from God, — the Revealer, so to speak, of God's truth to the world. With Paul it is the one who has been crucified and has been

¹ Rom. 3²¹⁻²⁸.

² Phil. 3⁹.

raised from the dead. At least, these are the emphases. Jesus speaks indeed of faith in himself as the one lifted up, as the serpent in the wilderness was lifted up; but all through that Capernaum discourse, and in the discourse to the Jerusalem Jews, the idea is of faith in himself as the one who has come from heaven to do God's work, to reveal God's truth: "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.¹ . . . I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on me may not abide in the darkness."² So indeed Paul speaks of God's manifestation of the plan of salvation and of his setting forth of Jesus Christ to be the propitiation of this plan, which necessarily involves Christ as the Revealer and the Executor of his plan; but the faith of this plan rests, after all, in the Christ who has been offered up in this propitiatory way: "Whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, by his blood."³ So the Christ of whom he speaks to the Philippians, in whom it was his ambition to be found through faith, was a Christ who had died and

¹ Jno. 6²⁹.

² Jno. 12⁴⁶.

³ Rom. 3²⁵.

been raised again: "That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, becoming conformed unto his death."¹ And so, very plainly, he says to the Galatians that, in regard to himself, the life which he now lives in the flesh he lives in faith, — the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved him, and gave himself up for him.²

And there is evident another difference. Jesus brings out the ethical condition surrounding salvation, while Paul seems to rest everything upon faith. In the passages quoted above Jesus speaks plainly indeed of the necessity of faith in himself; but these references to faith are but items in his teaching, the burden of which is repentance and new living. This was the Gospel he preached: "The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye and believe in the gospel."³ This was the basal principle on which rested his Sermon on the Mount: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will

¹ Phil. 3¹⁰.

² Gal. 2²⁰.

³ Mk. 1¹⁶; Mt. 4¹⁷.

of my Father which is in heaven."¹ "I say unto you, that except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the Kingdom of heaven."² This was his warning to his disciples: "And if thy hand cause thee to stumble, thy foot, thine eye, cut it off, cast it out; it is good for thee to enter into life maimed, halt, with one eye, rather than having thy two hands, thy two feet, thy two eyes, to go into hell, into the unquenchable fire where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched."³ And when some of his company told him of the Galileans whom Pilate had slaughtered, he said to them: "Think ye that these Galileans were sinners above all the Galileans, because they have suffered these things? I tell you, Nay: but, except ye repent, ye shall all in like manner perish. Or those eighteen, upon whom the tower in Siloam fell, and killed them, think ye that they were offenders above all the men that dwell in Jerusalem? I tell you, Nay: but, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish."⁴ And when they asked him

¹ Mt. 7²¹.² Mt. 5²⁰.³ Mk. 9⁴³⁻⁴⁸; Mt. 18^{8 f.}⁴ Lk. 13¹⁻⁵.

whether there were few that should be saved he said unto them: "Strive to enter in by the narrow door: for many, I say unto you, shall seek to enter in, and shall not be able."¹ So, on the other hand, Paul involves indeed in the faith he preaches a new character and a new living. He tells the Galatians that "In Christ Jesus, neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith working through love,"² or, as he expresses it further on, "a new creature."³ He puts "faith and a good conscience" together before Timothy.⁴ He asks the Corinthians if they do not know that "the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God,"⁵ and warns them that "we must all be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ; that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he hath done, whether it be good or bad."⁶ But the burden of Paul's teaching is the absolute necessity of faith, in sharp contrast to any possibility of a self-merited salvation through works. The argument of Galatians is based upon this

¹ v. 24.² Gal. 5⁶.³ 6¹⁵.⁴ I Tim. 1¹⁹, 3⁹.⁵ I Cor. 6⁹.⁶ II Cor. 5¹⁰.

idea. The argument of Romans follows along this line. Even from the Corinthian letters, which have so much to do with the practical strife and sin of the congregation, from the Ephesian letter, so full of its Christian unity, and from the letter to the Philippians, so crowded with its personal affairs, it is not absent. It is needless to cite particular passages. It is evident to us as the almost characteristic Pauline thought.

Here stand then two differences in this doctrine of the condition of salvation, — a difference in the presentation of the Christ, around whom the condition gathers, and a difference in the emphatic element of the condition itself. How are the differences to be accounted for? It seems to me very evident that they are to be accounted for in exactly the same way as the differences in the doctrine of man's relation to God. Christ stood at the historic point where the great fact before the people was the fact of his having come into the world with the revelation of God's truth of salvation. His death was not yet a fact. Upon himself personally their faith was to rest. But the Christ

they could understand, could realize, could grasp, was the Christ who was standing among them with this message from God. To him they could come; in him they could believe. Could they have done as much if they had had presented to them for their faith the Christ of Calvary? As a matter of fact, did Nicodemus, did the Jews, did the disciples understand the Christ who was to be lifted up, who was to give himself as the bread of life for the world?¹ Was it not different with their reception of him as a teacher from God, as the one whom the Father had sent into the world?²

It is readily admitted that a faith so limited was not a faith as full and outrounded as the faith in the Christ who loved us and gave himself in death for us; but was not its limitation a simple necessity, conditioned by the stage in the historical progress of events to which it belonged? The Old Testament faith was, in this sense, even less full and complete; but could it have possibly been anything else than the limited faith it was, — a faith in Jehovah

¹ Jno. 3 10-15, 6 58-60, 12 82-84.

² Jno. 3 2, 7 23-31, 40-43, 6 67-69, 16 27, 17 8, 25.

rather than in the Christ; a faith in Jehovah as promising salvation, prefiguring it through ritual and ceremony, a faith of type and shadow? Could it have been anything else than this and have belonged to the pre-Messianic times? The fact that, with all God did to make plain what the coming salvation was to be, men were yet slow of heart to understand it, simply shows how hard it was to get them to grasp the truth before it became historically a fact. The question is not so much why Paul presented the Christ of faith as he did. His is the full presentation of which Christ's words are the hint. The question is why Christ did not himself give us the full statement and not simply the hint. To this it seems to me the historical surrounding in which Christ stood is all the answer we need.

So it stands with the different emphases which Christ and Paul place upon the condition of man's salvation. Jesus's preaching of the Gospel of repentance and new living was not simply the taking up of the Gospel which his forerunner had proclaimed; it was the specific statement of the Gospel for the times in which

he himself stood, — times of the old living of hypocritical ceremonialism, of whited sepulchre externalism, of Pharisaic pride and self-conceit, of Sadducean scepticism and Herodian politics. Over against this it would seem as though Jesus could lay emphasis upon nothing else than repentance and new living. This was the Gospel he had to preach. And Paul could not ignore these ethical needs; for he stood in the full moral rottenness of the heathen world, where the works of the flesh were only too manifest. He had to say, and he did say, that those who practised such things should not inherit the Kingdom of God.¹ But he stood also in the full light of the Judaizing contest, where the people of his churches had been clearly confronted with the insistent, persistent claim that not only was the keeping of the Mosaic law enough, but the non-keeping of it was not enough to salvation. Over against this what could he do but lay all the emphasis of which he was master upon the absolute necessity of faith, apart from any works of any kind, if a man would be accepted of God?

¹ Gal. 5¹⁹⁻²¹.

Thus it comes naturally that Paul's holding forth of this idea of faith is most largely present in the Epistles which have to do with this controversy and its effects, — the Epistle to the Galatians and the Epistle to the Romans; and thus it comes naturally that the comparative absence of this idea from the Corinthian Epistles shows that Paul's trouble in the city was occasioned by another stage of this controversy, — a personal and factional stage, in which the claim of the Mosaic works had not yet been made.

There is no strangeness therefore in these differences between Christ and Paul. They are not differences that throw the Apostle out of doctrinal harmony with his Master. They are not Pharisaic peculiarities arbitrarily thrust athwart the teachings of Christ. In essence Jesus and Paul are at one. The differences are due, just as the others were, to the simple evolution of events in the beginning of Christianity, a state of things which they who hold to evolution ideas should be the first to discover and the most earnest to maintain. Christ, no more than Paul, should be removed from the

historical conditions of the stage of Christianity's announcement to the world in which he stood. There should be a full and candid recognition of that stage and the limitations which it bore for him, as well as the opportunities which Paul's stage gave to him, and so it should be understood that Christ could not have spoken all that Paul spoke, though he bore fully in his heart the message which he wrought out in his death; while on the other hand Paul could not have excused himself from speaking more than Christ had spoken, though, through revelation, he got the fulness of his message from what Christ himself wrought.

V

COMPARISON OF THE TEACHINGS OF JESUS AND PAUL

IN our comparison of the teachings of Jesus and of Paul there remain two important points where these relations should be considered:—

The point of *the relation of the Holy Spirit to the new life of the believer* and the point of *the Person of Christ*.

III. As to the relation of the Holy Spirit to the new life of the believer, in substance Paul and Jesus agree that the Spirit is essential to this life. Jesus could not have stated this more plainly than he did in his words to Nicodemus: "Except a man be born anew — be born of water and the Spirit — he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."¹ Without the Spirit this life could not begin, and without the Spirit this life could not continue. His promise to the

¹ Jno. 3^{3, 5}.

disciples that Passover night is very clear: "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may be with you forever, *even* the Spirit of truth: whom the world cannot receive; for it beholdeth him not, neither knoweth him; ye know him; for he abideth with you, and shall be in you."¹ This teaching is essentially repeated by Paul. With him the Spirit is necessary to the beginning of the life. "According to his mercy he saved us, through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost."² With him also it is needful for the continuance of the life. The eighth chapter of Romans is based on this idea. "God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and as an offering for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: that the requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit. For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the spirit the things of the spirit. For the mind of the flesh is death; but the mind of the spirit is life and peace. . . . But

¹ Jno. 14¹⁶ f.

² Tit. 3^{5b}.

if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. . . . So, then, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh: for if ye live after the flesh, ye must die; but if by the spirit ye mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are the sons of God.”¹

And yet, along with this magnifying of the Spirit, both Jesus and Paul hold strongly to the responsibility of the believer for an individual self-activity in his spiritual life. This is evident in the teachings of Jesus when he demanded from those who would enter the Kingdom a righteousness that should exceed that of the Pharisees;² and for those who have entered it, a character that should be as perfect as that of their Father in Heaven.³ The necessity of the Spirit's influence upon the nature of man, and his abiding presence in his inner life, went along, and naturally went along, with the necessity of a manifestation of that influence and abiding presence in new and righteous living.

¹ Rom. 8^{3b-6, 9b, 12-14}. ² Mt. 5²⁰. ³ v. 48; Lk. 6³⁶.

It was the same with Paul. Needful as was the regenerating and regulating influence of the Holy Ghost, the Apostle did not consider the believer absolved from the responsibility of self-activity. "I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your reasonable service. And be not fashioned according to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God."¹ In fact, in the very passages where the need of the Spirit is dwelt upon, there this individual responsibility of life is brought out. "God condemned sin in the flesh: that the requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit."² "So, then, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh: for if ye live after the flesh, ye must die; but if by the spirit ye mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live."³

At the same time however while this agree-

¹ Rom. 12¹f.

² Rom. 8³f.

³ v. 12^f.

ment between the Master and his Apostle exists, there can be no doubt but that Paul has developed this doctrine of the relation of the Holy Spirit to the believer's life as Jesus has not done. With Paul the Spirit is the great salvation gift. He tells the Galatians that "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree: in order that upon the Gentiles might come the blessing of Abraham in Christ Jesus; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith."¹ He tells the Corinthians and the Ephesians that the Spirit is the seal by which we are secured to our future redemption.² He tells the Romans that it is the pledge of our membership in the spiritual family of God; so that it comes to be the witness within us of our new life.³ With Paul the Spirit is the power of the new life, — its power against the old life of the flesh. "Walk by the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh."⁴ It ministers to us the grace of the new living, — love,

¹ Gal. 3¹³ f..

³ Rom. 8¹⁴⁻¹⁶.

² II Cor. 1²²; Eph. 1¹³ f., 4³⁰.

⁴ Gal. 5¹⁶.

joy, hope, and wisdom from above.¹ It is, in fact, the great principle of the new life, regulating and controlling and inspiring and vitalizing the whole man, the principle by which we are to walk, if we are to live, and which, if it is regnant within us, is a fountain source of life and peace.²

Now this development does not appear in Jesus' teaching. With Christ the Holy Spirit seems to be largely intended as the power needful for the fulfilment of the disciples' duties, especially those in connection with their Gospel work. The general promise was, that the Spirit should abide with them forever, and so form part of their personal living;³ but, in the further statement of his promise, the emphasis was laid upon the Spirit's work in unfolding to the disciples the teachings of Christ, in bearing witness to him, in guiding the disciples into the truth and disclosing to them events.⁴ So, after his resurrection, in giving to his disciples their commission, he

¹ I Th. 1⁶; I Cor. 2¹³, 6¹⁹; Rom. 5⁵, 14¹⁷, 15^{18, 16}; II Tim. 1¹⁴.

² II Cor. 3¹⁸; Rom. 8⁴⁻⁶; Eph. 2²².

³ Jno. 14^{16 f.}

⁴ Jno. 14²⁶, 15²⁶, 16¹³⁻¹⁶.

significantly followed it with a breathing upon them of the Holy Ghost,¹ and directed them, in his words to them at his ascension, to tarry in the city before beginning their great mission, until they were clothed with power from on high.² Specially was the Spirit to be with the disciples in their persecutions and give them what they should say to those before whom they would be summoned. On three separate occasions does Jesus press this home upon his disciples, as though he would have them remember it without fail.³

Here then stands the difference between Christ and Paul, — a difference almost wholly of development. Christ dwelt simply upon one or two points of the Spirit's work; Paul carried out the work into a wider sweep, and brought the Spirit into contact with the believer's character and living, as Jesus had not done.

How is this difference to be accounted for, except by the fact that Jesus stood before Paul after the Day of Pentecost?

It was the great difficulty of Jesus's training

¹ Jno. 20²².

² Lk. 24¹⁹.

³ Lk. 12¹¹ f., Mt. 10¹⁹, Mk. 13¹¹, Lk. 21¹⁴ f.

of the Twelve to get them to understand the spiritual character of his mission. Spiritual things seemed hard, — almost impossible for them to grasp. The Master's work stood before them materially; their own future relation to it lay in their minds the same way. Before the Spirit had been outpoured upon them, to enlighten them in spiritual things, Jesus had to come to them in the simplest language, and with the simplest truths, especially in reference to the Spirit's relationship to them. And so he does not hold forth the Spirit to them as the regulating and vitalizing principle of the new living, destroying the lusts of the flesh and transforming his people into the character image of himself. He simply promises him as the Comforter who shall abide with them forever, and who shall open their minds to a fuller understanding of his teachings. He does not speak of him as the seal of their redemption, nor the pledge of their spiritual sonship, nor the witness within them of their regenerated life; he simply tells them he shall be a power to them in their work and an inspiration to them in their defence before their persecutors. For

these were promises they could appreciate, and, in a measure, grasp and comprehend. The fact was before them, in a confused and bewildering way, that Jesus was to leave them; as far as they understood that fact they could understand that the Spirit was to take his place and teach them of him. The fact was before them, vaguely and indefinitely, that they were to go out into the world as their Master's workers; as far as they understood that fact they could understand that the Spirit was to help them in their work. The fact was before them, perhaps more plainly than we think, that they were to suffer persecution for the Gospel's sake; as far as it was plainly before them they could understand the Spirit was to be with them in the persecutions they should suffer. Historically this was all Jesus could tell them. And, as a matter of fact, Jesus tells his disciples plainly that his teachings were limited by the historical development of events.¹ He had not spoken to them as plainly at the beginning of his ministry as he spoke to them at its close. They were not then prepared for plain speak-

¹ Jno. 16⁴.

ing. So now what he says to them is simply in outline hint, — in suggestion, so to speak. That was all they could bear. When the Spirit was come he would teach them all things and bring what he then said to them into their fuller knowledge and understanding. "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth. . . . He shall glorify me: for he shall take of mine, and shall declare it unto you."¹ And it seems to be in line with these statements that the Fourth Evangelist himself feels called upon to take up the symbolic words of Christ, on the last day of the Feast of Tabernacles, and explain them as referring to the spiritual influence of the Holy Ghost upon the believer's life, at the same time impliedly excusing the symbolism, because the Spirit was not yet given.² But, with the Day of Pentecost now behind them as an event of history, with the Father's promise of the outpouring of the Spirit actually realized within their hearts and lives, why should not the Master's

¹ Jno. 16^{12, 13 a, 14}.

² Jno. 7³⁷⁻³⁹.

words prove true, that they should enter into the grasping of truths which had been beyond their comprehension before? And why should not the Apostle, under this very new grasping of truth, make known, in a fuller way, what Jesus had given of this Spirit's relationship to the believer's life? Is this not the reason why Paul attaches the Spirit so specifically to the *χαρίσματα* and the miracle activity in the Church?¹ Could he have done less with the Church's experience on the Day of Pentecost, and, in fact, with the daily experience of the Church and himself before his consciousness? Jesus gives the substance of this miracle power of the Holy Spirit, by making the wonder-working activity of the disciples dependent upon the reality of their spiritual life.² This spiritual life Paul makes dependent upon the Holy Ghost; and so, as miracles and gifts came into the experience of the Church and of himself, he naturally makes dependent upon the Holy Spirit the power for their working. It was simply the necessary historical unfolding of Christ's own teaching.

¹ I Cor. 12⁴⁻¹¹; Rom. 15^{18 f.}

² Mk. 9²⁹; Mt. 17^{19 f.}; Mk. 11^{22 f.}; Mt. 21^{21 f.}

IV. From these teachings of Jesus and Paul concerning the great themes of man's relation to God, the condition of salvation and the work of the Holy Spirit, we come, naturally, to their teaching concerning that theme which stands, in its importance, above them all; because, in its relationship, it stands fundamentally beneath them all, — the theme of *the Person of Christ*.

With but a general study of the Gospels and Epistles, it is quite evident that Jesus and Paul hold essentially to the same view regarding the Person of Christ.

They both maintain a real humanity in the Person, — a statement which indeed scarcely needs proof; but which, in the case of Jesus, is evident from the confessions which he makes of bodily conditions and necessities,¹ and his definite acknowledgments of human relationships.² In addition to which stand, with confirming significance, the Messianic name of "Son of Man," which he so generally uses of

¹ E. g. Mk. 10³³ f., Mt. 20¹⁸ f., Lk. 18³²⁻³⁴; Lk. 24³⁹⁻⁴⁸; Jno. 4⁷, 19²⁸.

² E. g. Mk. 3³¹⁻³⁵, Mt. 12⁴⁶⁻⁵⁰, Lk. 8¹⁹⁻²¹; Jno. 19²⁶ f.

himself,¹ the subjection to the law, under which he so constantly places himself,² and the religious relations to God which he always maintains.³

Correspondingly Paul holds most clearly to the human generation and birth of Jesus,⁴ to his human life on earth,⁵ and his human death.⁶ In addition to which, confirmingly of this all, he also gives to him the title of "Man," — significantly and emphatically gives it to him, — "one mediator between God and men, a man, Christ Jesus."⁷ He also recognizes his subjection to the Law,⁸ and, while not in the same definite way as the author of Hebrews, yet quite plainly indicates his religious relationship to God.⁹ These things are, of course, evident at first reading.

¹ E. g. Mk. 2²⁸, Mt. 12⁸, Lk. 6⁵; Mt. 11¹⁹, Lk. 7³⁴; Mt. 8²⁰, Lk. 9⁵⁸; Jno. 5²⁷.

² E. g. Mt. 3¹⁵; Lk. 4^{16 f.}; Mt. 17²⁴⁻²⁷.

³ E. g. Mt. 11^{25 f.}; Jno. 11^{41 f.}; Jno. 14²⁸, 17¹⁻²⁶; Lk. 23^{34, 46}; Mk. 15³⁴, Mt. 27⁴⁶; Jno. 20¹⁷.

⁴ E. g. Acts 13²⁸; Gal. 4⁴; Rom. 1⁸.

⁵ E. g. II Cor. 5¹⁶; Phil. 2^{7 f.}

⁶ E. g. I Th. 4¹⁴; I Cor. 15⁸.

⁷ I Tim. 2⁵; cf. I Cor. 15^{21, 47}; Rom. 5¹⁵.

⁸ E. g. Gal. 4⁴; Rom. 8^{3 f.}

⁹ E. g. I Cor. 3²³, 15^{27 f.}; Eph. 1¹⁷.

It is also clear that Jesus and Paul are essentially one in maintaining a real divinity in this Person of Christ. They both use the term "Son of God,"¹ and mean by it something more than was understood by the Jews of their time as resting in the Messianic title.²

This is evident on Jesus's part: (a) from his reply to Nathaniel's confession of faith at the gaining of his first disciples in Judea;³ (b) from his conversation with Nicodemus in Jerusalem;⁴ (c) from his controversy with the Jews in Jerusalem at the Feast of Dedication;⁵ (d) from his conversation with Martha at her brother's grave;⁶ (e) from the question which he put to the Scribes and Pharisees during those closing days of his ministry in Jerusalem;⁷ (f) and from his answer to the

¹ E. g. Gospels: Jno. 3¹⁶⁻¹⁸, 5²⁵, 10³⁶, 11⁴; cf. such Synoptic passages as Mt. 11²⁷; Mk. 13³²; Epistles: II Cor. 1¹⁹; Gal. 2²⁰; Rom. 1^{3 f.}; Eph. 4¹³.

² For the Messianic ideas of the Jews of Jesus's time, consult Stanton, *The Jewish and the Christian Messiah*, Edinburgh, 1886. Schürer, *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, transl. 5 vols., New York, 1896. Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, Leipzig, 1897².

³ Jno. 1^{50 f.}

⁴ Jno. 3¹⁶⁻¹⁸, cf. v. 2.

⁵ Jno. 10²⁹⁻⁴¹.

⁶ Jno. 11²⁰⁻²⁷.

⁷ Mk. 12³⁵⁻³⁷, Mt. 22⁴¹⁻⁴⁵, Lk. 20⁴¹⁻⁴⁴.

question put to him at the Sanhedrim trial,¹ and the charge against him which the Sanhedrim confessed to before Pilate.² In all of these cases Christ makes plain that what was comprehended, as in this Messianic term of the day, was far different from what he claimed for himself in the title.³

It is evident also on Paul's part. In his Epistle to the Galatians he speaks of the revelation of the Son, which came to him as a Jew who held to this hope of a coming Messianic Son of God, — a hope which was so much of a contrast with this new faith that the fact of this Son of God was a revelation.⁴ He also contrasts there his previous life as a Jew and the Christian life, which he now lives by faith in the Son of God.⁵

And they both refer to the Christ, and speak of him in a way that could not have been understood then, nor can be understood to-day as applicable to Christ's believers.

This is evident on Christ's part, — not so

¹ Mk. 14⁶¹ f., Mt. 26⁶⁸ f., Lk. 22⁶⁶⁻⁷⁰.

² Jno. 19⁷.

³ Forrest, *The Christ of History*, pp. 69-73.

⁴ Gal. 1¹⁶.

⁵ Gal. 2²⁰.

much from the special term "Only Begotten," which he applies to himself in the third chapter of John,¹ which some maintain are the words of the Evangelist and not of Christ,² but rather, from the everywhere unique relationship to God which he claims for himself, — a relationship which comes out most especially in the Fourth Gospel, — the Gospel which gives us the deep and profound inner life of Christ, — a relationship which involves a conscious, personal pre-existence of himself with God,³ that is, if any reason is to be allowed to the usage of words, and we are not to understand them in some such mystical sense as Beyschlag would give to them.⁴ The passages in the sixth and in the seventeenth chapters of John cannot be understood in anything less than a divine way. "I am the living bread which came down out of heaven"⁵ may be a figurative expression, but it is not possible to resolve this figure on a

¹ vs. 16, 18.

² Cf. Neander, Tholuck, Olshausen, Westcott, Dods, sub loc.

³ E. g. Jno. 3¹³, 6⁸⁸, 46, 50 f., 58, 62, 7²⁹, 8^{38, 42, 57-59} (cf. 3^{11 f., 31 f.}),
 10¹⁶ (cf. 7²⁹, 8³⁵; Mt. 10³⁴⁻⁴¹, 11²⁷), 14⁹⁻¹¹ (cf. 10³⁰), 16^{27 f.},
 17^{5, 8, 22-25}.

⁴ *Biblische Theologie*, Bd. I. S. 244-248.

⁵ Jno. 6⁵¹.

human basis; while the petition of the valedictory prayer, "Glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was,"¹ is impossible of meaning as applied to any believer. And this is a relationship which involves also a personal resurrection from the dead, and a personal ascension into the glory and power of the Godhead, as belonging to himself.²

That they speak of Christ in a way which cannot be referred to Christian believers is evident also, on the Apostle's part, not only from such expressions as show Christ to possess the existence form of God, *μορφῆ θεοῦ*,³ and to be God's image, *εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ*,⁴ — such phraseology is indeed significant; but, more than this, from such definite statements as make him (a) existent before the creation of the universe;⁵ (b) the creator and vital upholder, as God himself, of all things;⁶ (c) risen

¹ Jno. 17⁵.

² E. g. Mk. 14⁶², Mt. 26^{68 f.}, Lk. 22⁶⁹; Mt. 28¹⁸; Jno. 3¹³, 5^{22, 25-27}, 10¹⁸, 14^{2-1, 12, 23}, 16²⁸, 17^{1 f., 5}.

³ Phil. 2⁶.

⁴ II Cor. 4⁴; Col. 1¹⁵.

⁵ E. g. Col. 1¹⁷ (cf. Gal. 4⁴; I Tim. 1^{1b}).

⁶ E. g. I Cor. 8⁶; Rom. 11³⁶; Col. 1^{16 f.}

and ascended into the heavens;¹ (d) and the present possessor of the divine glory and power of the Godhead on high.² Such a passage as that found in the first chapter of Colossians can leave no doubt as to the divine element in Paul's christology: "Who is the image of the invisible God, the first born of all creation; for in him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, — things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things have been created through him, and unto him; and he is before all things, and in him all things consist."³ And when it is realized that these statements are confirmed by similar ones in others of Paul's later Epistles,⁴ and hinted at by statements in his earlier writings,⁵ which involve these more precise terms, the conclusion is scarcely less than absolute that Paul's theology, from the beginning, held

¹ E. g. I Th. 4¹⁴; I Cor. 15^{4, 12-14, 16, 20}; II Cor. 5¹⁵; Rom. 1^{4, 6} (cf. Phil. 3¹⁰), 14⁹; Col. 2¹² (cf. 3¹).

² E. g. Eph. 1^{10, 20-22}; Col. 3¹; Phil. 2⁹⁻¹¹ (cf. I Cor. 15²⁷; Col. 2¹⁰).

³ Vs. 15-17.

⁴ E. g. Phil. 2⁶⁻¹¹; Eph. 1²⁰⁻²³, 4⁸⁻¹⁰.

⁵ E. g. Rom. 11⁸⁶; I Cor. 8⁶; II Cor. 4⁴.

to a Christ who was supernaturally above and beyond any possible one of his believers. These things are clearly evident and cannot be argued away, save at the cost of all self-respecting honesty of logic and common sense.

There would seem therefore to be little room for difference between the teachings of Paul and those of Christ on this basal point of the Christian religion. They both apparently hold to the same things, — to a true humanity and a real divinity in the Person of Christ.

But it is a matter of interest to notice that, if there be emphases in Christ's teaching, they tend in the direction of the prominence given in them to the fact of his heavenly origin. This fact forms part of his earliest teaching. He says, for example, to Nicodemus: "We speak that we do know, and bear witness of that we have seen: and ye receive not our witness. If I told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you heavenly things? And no man hath ascended into heaven, but he that descended out of

heaven, even the Son of Man, which is in heaven." ¹ And what he says definitely to this teacher of Israel finds a hint, at least, in the claim he makes at the cleansing of the temple, which he accomplishes during this stay in Jerusalem, — the claim that this temple is his Father's house. ² It forms also part of his latest teaching. On that day when the Greeks came to see him, — that Tuesday before the crucifixion, when the eager desire of these aliens had stirred up his heart by its vivid contrast with the indifferent ignorance of his own people, — "Jesus cried and said, He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me. And he that beholdeth me beholdeth him that sent me. I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on me may not abide in the darkness. And if any man hear my sayings, and keep them not, I judge him not: for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world. He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my sayings, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I spake, the same shall judge him in the last day. For

¹ Jno. 3¹¹⁻¹⁸.

² Jno. 2¹⁶.

I spake not from myself; but the Father which sent me, he hath given me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is life eternal: the things, therefore, which I speak, even as the Father hath said unto me, so I speak.”¹ It belongs further to his teaching among his followers, both in Galilee and in Judea. We find it before that turning-point, in his instruction which came at Cæsarea Philippi, when he called upon his disciples for a confession of faith in his Messiahship, — for example, in his address in the synagogue at Capernaum, when he told his over-enthusiastic followers that he was the true bread which had come down from heaven, and that he had come down from heaven not to do his own will, but the will of him that had sent him.² We find it after that turning-point, even up to the last days before his passion on Calvary, — in his valedictory remarks to his disciples, when he told them plainly that he came forth from the Father and was come into the world, and again was to leave the world and return unto the

¹ Jno. 12⁴⁴⁻⁵⁰.

² Jno. 6^{32 f., 85, 38, 51}.

Father;¹ and in his high-priestly prayer, when he petitioned that the Father would glorify him with the glory which he had had with him before the world was.² But especially does it belong to his teaching in Jerusalem among the hostile Jews. We find it at the Feast of the Fifth of John and at the following Feast of Tabernacles, when he gave the Jews to understand that he was come in his Father's name, and that his Father bore witness of him, that he came forth and was come of God; so that before Abraham was, I am;³ and at the Feast of Dedication, when he claimed that the Father had consecrated him, and sent him into the world.⁴

And it is not only generally present throughout his teaching, but present in a significant way. It is not simply announced as a fact, but it is assumed and handled as part of the reasoning which his teaching involves. He places it, for example, as the source of his revelatory teaching and of the commission which he held to his redemptive work. This was the way he

¹ Jno. 16²⁸.

² Jno. 17⁵.

³ Jno. 5⁴³, 8^{18, 42, 58}.

⁴ Jno. 10⁸⁶.

laid it before the Jews at the Feast of Tabernacles: "He that sent me is true; and the things which I heard from him, these speak I unto the world."¹ "I speak the things which I have seen with my Father."² This was the way he held it to the hearts of his disciples. "I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard from my Father I have made known unto you."³ "The word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me. . . . As the Father gave me commandment, even so I do."⁴ "I lay down my life for the sheep. . . . I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment received I from my Father."⁵

He makes it further the basis of his Messianic claims and of his Messianic condemnation for the rejection of his claims. So does he specially use it with the Jews: "I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not: if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive."⁶ "Ye are from beneath; I am

¹ Jno. 8²⁶.² Jno. 8³⁸.³ Jno. 15¹⁵.⁴ Jno. 14^{24, 31}.⁵ Jno. 10^{15, 18}.⁶ Jno. 5⁴³.

from above: ye are of this world; I am not of this world. . . . If God were your Father, ye would love me: for I came forth and am come from God; for neither have I come of myself, but he sent me." ¹

Yet more, he holds it forth as that which gives efficiency to his redemptive work: "This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die. I am the living bread which came down out of heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever." ² "I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on me may not abide in the darkness." ³ "No one knoweth the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him." ⁴ "And the glory which thou hast given me I have given unto them; that they may be one, even as we are one." ⁵

Now in comparison with this prominent and varied usage of the fact of his heavenly origin, his reference to his coming resurrection, and ascension and session in power and glory above,

¹ Jno. 8^{23, 42}.

² Jno. 6^{69 f.}

³ Jno. 12⁴⁶.

⁴ Mt. 11²⁷ (cf. Lk. 10²²).

⁵ Jno. 17²².

stand out in a peculiar way. They do not so much pervade his teaching, entering into his arguments and incorporating themselves in his reasoning, they rather constitute simple points of statement which he announces from time to time, in a plain and unelaborated way. As to his resurrection he says: "The Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders, and the chief priests, and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again."¹ This statement is made more than once during the latter part of his ministry, in somewhat similar phraseology.² As to his ascension, he asks: "Doth this cause you to stumble? What then if ye should behold the Son of man ascending where he was before?"³ This was said to his followers in his address at Capernaum, after the miracle of the loaves and fishes. As to his session in power and his coming again he declares: "Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming on the

¹ Mk. 8³¹, Mt. 16²¹, Lk. 9²².

² Cf. Mk. 9³⁰ f., Mt. 17²² f., Lk. 9^{43 b-45}; Mk. 10³²⁻³⁴, Mt. 20¹⁷⁻¹⁹, Lk. 18³¹⁻³³.

³ Jno. 6^{61 b f.}

clouds of heaven.”¹ This was his announcement to the high priest at the midnight trial before the Sanhedrim. They are simple statements, all of them, involving neither argument nor debate. The only way in which his ascension can be said to enter more formally into his teaching is in his valedictory remarks to his disciples, where twice he apparently places his “going to the Father” as the basis of the promises he is making to them.² Once he uses it as the reason for the work of righteousness which the Holy Spirit is to do in the world.³

On one occasion he may possibly be said, in an indirect way, to bring his resurrection argumentatively into his teaching. It is in Bethany, at the grave of Lazarus, as he reasons with Martha for the sake of her faith.⁴ And only once really can he be understood to elaborate the statement of his session in power above, and that is in his eschatological remarks to his disciples during the last days in Jerusalem, when he pictures to them the last coming of the Son of man and the scenes of the judgment

¹ Mk. 14⁶², Mt. 26⁶⁴, Lk. 22⁶⁹.

² Jno. 14² f. (cf. 7³²⁻³⁴), v. 12.

³ Jno. 16⁸⁻¹⁰.

⁴ Jno. 11²³⁻²⁶.

day.¹ But, apart from these passages, his references to these events seem to be simply by way of announcement in undeveloped form, sometimes even in a figurative and vague way.

So much for the teachings of Jesus. When now we turn to those of his Apostle, we find there, on the other hand, that, if there be emphases, they tend rather in the direction of the prominence given to just those facts which seem with Jesus to be unemphatic,—the facts of resurrection, ascension and session in power above.

This, to be sure, might seem quite natural as far as the resurrection is concerned; since it was this truth which formed the basis of the general Apostolic preaching. We are prepared therefore to notice how it enters into the Apostle's appeal to the Jews for the Messiahship of Jesus, as in his Antioch speech, where he proves the resurrection by the witness of the disciples and shows its agreement with Old Testament prophecy.² We are ready to understand how he holds it to condition the reasonableness of his whole Gospel of salva-

¹ Mk. 13²⁶ f., Mt. 24³⁰ f., Lk. 21²⁷ f.; Mt. 25³¹⁻³³.

² Acts 13³⁰⁻³⁷.

tion and of his people's faith in a Saviour, as in his argument of the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians.¹ We can see how essentially for him it stands connected with the deity of Christ, as in the opening of his Epistle to the Romans, where he says that Jesus Christ was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead.² We realize how vitally for him it is bound up with the surety of our personal resurrection, when we read in First Thessalonians: "If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also that are fallen asleep in Jesus will God bring with him."³ And we can see how impellingly for him it enters into the conduct of Christian life, when we turn to that personal chapter of Philippians and hear him say that he counted all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ; that he might be found in him and that he might know him and the power of his resurrection.⁴

¹ vs. 1-20.

² Rom. 1⁴.

³ 4¹⁴ (cf. I Cor. 15²⁰⁻²⁸; Rom. 6⁵; Phil. 3²¹; Col. 1¹⁸).

⁴ 3¹⁰.

But this emphasis is apparently true also of the ascension of Christ and his session in power, though perhaps in a less marked way. It enters, for example, into the Apostle's argument of Christian assurance: "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth; who is he that shall condemn? It is Christ Jesus that died, yea, rather, that was raised from the dead who is at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us."¹ It forms a decided background to his appeal for new and better living: "Brethren, be ye imitators together of me, and mark them which so walk even as ye have us for an ensample. . . . For our citizenship is in heaven; from whence, also, we wait for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of his glory."² "Let your forbearance be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand."³ It

¹ Rom. 8³³ f. (cf. I Th. 3¹³, 4¹⁴⁻¹⁸, 5²³; II Th. 1⁷⁻¹⁰, 2⁸; I Cor. 15²⁴⁻²⁶; Phil. 1⁶; II Tim. 1¹², 4^{8, 18}).

² Phil. 3^{17, 20} f.

³ 4⁵ (cf. I Th. 1¹⁰, 5²⁸; I Cor. 1⁷ f., 4⁵; Col. 3¹⁻⁶; I Tim. 6¹⁸ f.; II Tim. 4¹ f.; Tit. 2¹¹⁻¹⁸).

affects even his idea of the Church: "According to that working of the strength of his might, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead and made him to sit at his right hand in the heavenly kingdom of grace, far above all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: and he put all things in subjection under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all."¹ This does not mean, of course, that Paul leaves out of reference the divine origin of Jesus. This is also incorporated into his reasoning, standing generally as that great fact which gives significance to his Gospel and forms the background to the mystery of its truths;² but the emphasis, in the way of usage at least, lies in the direction we have noted.

Now we naturally seek for an explanation of these varying emphases, and it seems as though the principle we have already discovered, as

¹ Eph. I 19-23.

² I Cor. 8⁶; Gal. 4⁴; Rom. I 8, 8⁸, 8², II 8⁶; Col. I 16 f.

accounting for the more marked differences between the teachings of Jesus and of Paul, is the thing which gives the reason for the difference here. Apparently Jesus dwelt as fully as he did upon his divine origin because this was a fact before his disciples, as well as before himself. The knowledge of the nativity was evidently not confined to his own family, nor to his own disciples, nor to the people of the town of Bethlehem. The incidents of that event were there for him to build upon with these fuller statements of his heavenly origin.

On the other hand, the resurrection and ascension and session in power and final advent were, all of them, yet future events, whose coming hung so closely connected with the then, to his disciples and to the world, inexplicable mystery of his death, that it was well nigh impossible to enter into their discussion, or to do more with them than simply announce them with increasing frequency, as the time drew near for their realization. He could do little else with them than make them an accompaniment to his claims before the Jews,

or a help to his preparation of his disciples for the darkness of the days of his death.

With the Apostles however the resurrection and the ascension were as much facts as was the nativity; and while indeed the session in power might be beyond mere human vision, and the final advent an event which was yet to come, there was the fact of the ascension to make the glorified session easy of inference, and for both this and the advent itself they had these assured announcements which the Master himself had made.

It is not difficult therefore to understand how Paul came to dwell on all these truths and let them all enter argumentatively into his teaching; for they were all of them, so to speak, before him and before the people to whom he wrote. And, if there was to be emphasis at all in his teaching, it is not difficult to understand that it would most likely be at just these two points where, as a matter of fact, we find it. It would be at the point of the resurrection; for the basis of all Apostolic preaching was the fact that this crucified Jesus had risen from the dead. This was what gave

significance to the Gospel; for this death on Calvary was nothing if it were the death simply of a man, and the great testimony that it was not was in this fact of the risen Christ. This was what put enthusiasm behind the message which the Apostles gave and security beneath the faith which the world returned. Here was the power point in their proclaiming of the Christ. It was the great convincing argument for Jew and Gentile alike. Here necessarily there had to be a point of emphasis. It would be also at the point of the ascension into a session of power on high and the coming again; for these facts gathered themselves around the present needs of the Christians in their individual and collective struggle in the world, as their ever present and living hope. No soul fought its fight with sin but lifted its hands for help to the Christ who reigned in power upon the throne of grace above. No Church struggled against the persecuting hatred of the unbelieving world around it but looked for the promise of his coming in glory to judge the universe. In truth, here was the fact that held its influence over the Christian's daily living.

Its emphasis in all the Apostles' preaching therefore was perfectly natural, and in these respects Paul could hardly have afforded to differ from the rest. His Gospel was the same as theirs, and the people to whom he ministered were men of like struggles and similar needs with all.

It would seem then that, with these truths resting on the facts which stood before him and the people of his mission, Paul must have laid his emphasis upon them rather than upon that of the heavenly origin of Christ. They all indeed entered into his teaching, — entered into it argumentatively; they all belonged to his Gospel, — belonged to it essentially; but these facts of the resurrection, the ascension and the coming again, rather than that fact of the heavenly origin, came into his practical ministry in such a way as to make it impossible that he should not lay upon them the emphasis of what he said and wrote.

This last comparison then between the teachings of Jesus and Paul confirms the principle which we have found in all the comparisons we have made so far. We do not have here

indeed the same startling differences as we have elsewhere. There is nothing here which would seem to suggest disagreements that could not be reconciled. On the contrary, the agreement is marked; the only difference lies in the emphases which are used. But the difference here is accounted for, largely in the same way as the difference at the more serious points, by the historical events which stand behind them as their background. With Jesus it was the historical event of the nativity which confined his emphasis to the truth of the heavenly origin; with Paul it was the historical events of the nativity, and the resurrection and the ascension, which brought all three truths corporately into his body of teaching. His choice of emphasis among them was directed simply by the argumentative needs of his gospel, to which the resurrection was most significant, and by the practical needs of his people, to whom the encouragement and hope which resided in the session in power on high and the coming again to judge the world was most real. Indeed, if it be said, granted it was necessary, in order to prove the worth of the

sacrifice on Calvary, that Jesus should be shown to be some one more than man, that then there is no reason why Paul should not have laid his emphasis equally as well upon the nativity as upon the resurrection, — if this be said, it is evident that Paul chose the resurrection, not because there was, in his view, more of historical character to it than there was to the nativity, — which, as far as we have any evidence, was not his view; nor because it was, in his opinion, a historical event which would appeal more to his people, which indeed, as far as the event was concerned, might have been true; but because it was a historical event which was essentially connected with the fact of the crucifixion, around which gathered the Apostolic Gospel of salvation. It was argumentatively part and parcel of that event. It was the climax to Calvary.

The historical situation then restricted the emphasis which Jesus placed upon this teaching of his person, and widened out the emphasis which the Apostle used, — the argumentative and practical needs of his work developing them and directing him in their selection.

Should we need any further confirmation of our position it would be found in the apparent course pursued by Christ after his passion, in which he instructed his slow-hearted disciples in the Scriptures, as they bore upon the events which they had just witnessed. This seems to have been the significance of his talk with the two disciples on the way to Emmaus,¹ — and of his remarks to the company assembled together in Jerusalem.² He had abundant opportunity, during these forty days, of extended teaching concerning the things which were yet to come, and we may believe, from the statement in the prologue of Acts, that he was not silent regarding the general things of the Kingdom of God;³ but, as far as we have definite and specific statements, they go to show that his teaching was emphatically upon the things which he had previously spoken to them as coming, but which now were historically before them in the events of these last days, and that his method of teaching with regard to these things was to explain and unfold them to his disciples in the light of the Scriptures, which symbolically or prophet-

¹ Lk. 24²⁵⁻²⁷.

² Acts I³.

³ vs. 6-8.

ically referred to them. In other words, his teaching, during this time, was controlled by this same general historical principle, only now it gives us a hint as to how the Apostolic teaching would be widened out, when the illuminating day of Pentecost was fully come, and, at the same time, lays before us the reason why his previous teaching had been the restricted teaching it was. The whole thing rests in the historical situation.

There arises here however a very significant question. If the teaching of Jesus was so restricted and the teaching of the Apostles so widened by the facts which intervened between them, why may not the teaching of the Apostolic succession of to-day be further widened by the facts which have intervened between the Apostles and ourselves? If facts have played so controlling a part upon the teaching of Christianity, what right have we to stop considering facts when Pentecost was over? If historic evolution be considered at all, how is it possible not to consider it in the events of all the history of the Church, as well as in that part of it which is confined to the Apostolic

Age? This evolution process has been going on ever since the Apostles' times, and is as really active to-day as it was then; it would seem therefore that, if the principle for which we are contending be true, we must throw ourselves open to the admission that the development of Christ's teaching is not yet at its end, and events might occur which would compel us to give new interpretations to the initial utterances of Christ-interpretations, in fact, which, because of the greater number and more developed character of the facts, might set aside the interpretations which the Apostles themselves have given.

In a certain way this has happened. The Apostles had, for example, a certain understanding of Christ's prophecy regarding his final advent, which brought them to lay down certain principles regarding the time of its coming.¹ There can be no doubt that the accumulated facts of the Church's historic development have enabled us steadily to get nearer to the full value of these principles, —

¹ E. g. II Th. 2¹⁻¹²; I Tim. 4¹⁻³; I Jno. 2¹⁸; II Pet. 3⁸⁻¹⁴; Jude^{18 f.}

to find them indeed more sweeping than the Apostles perhaps themselves imagined them in their day. In like manner, the Apostles had a certain understanding of Christ's idea of the visible Church, which brought them, in the course of the Church's expansion, to apply it along certain lines of church organization.¹ There can be no question but the broadening facts of the Church's relations to the world and the Church's work and service in the world have enabled us to come to a fuller following out of these lines, to find them, in fact, farther reaching than perhaps the Apostles themselves conceived them in their day. We do not wish to deny these very evident facts, nor take anything away from the general statement towards which they point. It is certainly true that, as history proceeds in its development, it is quite likely to have its effect generally upon our interpretation of the teachings, both of Christ and of his disciples.

But, while this statement is made, there is another statement which must be made along with it and with equal honesty of admission.

¹ Acts 6¹⁻⁶, 13¹⁻⁸; I Cor. 12²⁸⁻³¹; Eph. 4⁷⁻¹⁸.

It must be clearly acknowledged that these specific facts which have so evidently controlled the teachings of Jesus and of Paul, — these facts of the nativity, the crucifixion, the resurrection, the ascension, and the day of Pentecost are unique facts, in that they constitute the beginning facts of Christianity. They are its foundation facts, — the events of history which threw Christianity into the world and established it, as a religion unlike any other religion, — supernatural as they were not supernatural, and divine as they were not divine.

But if this is so, then there follows one all-important conclusion. We are compelled to say, not merely that such facts must stand alone; for this, of course, they must do, if they constitute the facts of this religious initial establishment. The facts which have followed in Christianity's history may, some of them, be supernatural, as in the Apostolic Age, and many of them be of an almost divinely spiritual kind, as in all the ages since; but none of them belong to the unique initiatory class to which these facts above mentioned belonged. These stand, by their historic position in Christian-

ity's chronology, absolutely alone. The conclusion which follows however is more than this. It is that these facts, being unique as the foundation facts of Christianity, must gather around themselves a teaching which must also be considered unique as the fundamental teaching of Christianity, which teaching, as well as the facts around which it gathers, must stand alone.

We trust we shall not be misunderstood. We do not wish to be held as saying that the Apostolic teaching with regard to these initiatory events was complete at the outset. It grew into fulness and roundness, and developed into completeness as the Apostolic Age advanced. And it grew and developed thus largely through the influence of the events in the Apostolic mission work in the world. For, if we come back to Paul, by way of illustration, we shall see that his soteriology is fuller in the Galatian and Roman Epistles than in his letters to the Thessalonian and even the Corinthian Churches. This fulness came indirectly, it may be, but nevertheless really through the acute phase of the Judaistic con-

troverſy developed in the Galatian parishes. So his Chriſtology is more developed in his later than in his earlier Epistles. The development was due, at its emphatic points at leaſt, to the oppoſition of the Gnoſtic thinking which came upon his Asia Minor Churches towards the cloſe of his life. The bringing out of the nature and work of the Holy Spirit ſeems to have grown as his work went on, and we can underſtand how its growth owed itſelf largely to what his work ſhowed him of this gracious influence from above; while his idea of the ſeſſion in power on high changes noticeably in its ſpirituality from Thessaſonians to Ephesiaſians, and his conception of the final advent, at leaſt as far as its immediateness is concerned, broadens very decidedly in his later writings. It is not difficult to ſee how this change and this broadening may have been influenced by the deepening and the expanding of his miſſion work.

We do not, of course, ſeek to deny the factor of enlightening revelations made to the Apoſtle, from time to time. Such revelations he had in the more ordinary matters of his work; much

more likely is he to have had them also in these spiritual matters. He essentially began his life and work with the revelation in him of God's Son, and he says his Gospel, as a general term, came to him by revelation from above.¹ This we fully admit; but we are willing to believe, in addition, that there were influences upon his views which came from the experiences of his mission work. It is very natural that it should be so. The Apostles were men, and grew in their apprehension of truth as other men grow. They were workers, and the experiences of their work had a developing influence upon their ideas, as they would have upon the ideas of other men. It is not only perfectly natural, it is simply necessary that there should be development in the Apostolic theology, whether of Paul's or of Peter's or of John's; but we believe that, with the Apostolic ministry, this development of the fundamental teaching of Christianity ceased. We do not mean that our understanding of this fundamental teaching is not constantly broadening and deepening, and will ever continue

¹ Gal. I 11 f.

to do so; but as a fundamental teaching to be understood, we believe it rounds itself out with the close of the Apostolic ministry.

If we are questioned as to our reason for this belief, we reply that it lies in the peculiar relation which these Apostolic teachers held to these initiatory events. Jesus evidently chose, to carry on his work in the world, those who were largely in historical relation to these events, and they carried on the work largely by a historical declaration and interpretation of them. In other words, it seems to have been Christ's idea that these Apostles, these who were gathered around him at the last supper, and these others whom he should afterwards call to work and to teach along with them in the Apostolic establishment of Christianity, — Matthias, Paul, James, the head of the Jerusalem Church, the author of the Hebrews, — that these Apostles should be the constitutional interpreters of Christianity; that, just in proportion as these beginning events constituted Christianity, so the fundamental teaching of Christianity — the teaching of what Christianity constitutionally was — should be the interpre-

tation of these events; and that, while he himself was restricted from such an interpretation because these events had not yet historically occurred, these Apostles of his choosing should be unrestricted in such interpretation when these events had occurred. He does not seem to have contemplated events beyond these initiatory ones, as coming into the class which constituted Christianity; although he does seem to have intended that, beyond them, the events which constituted the mission experiences of these Apostles should influence them in their interpretation of these initiatory facts. But when this mission experience of these Apostolic teachers was over, it is evident that the historical development of the fundamental, constitutional, interpretation of Christianity was, according to Christ's idea, at an end.

The whole discussion consequently comes to this one question: Were these Apostolic teachers qualified so to declare and interpret these beginning facts as not to open their teaching to contradiction and correction by subsequent teachers, on the asserted basis of subsequent modifying facts? We do not say:

Were they qualified so as not to open their teaching to clearer understanding and fuller unfolding; for that must ever be possible, as the very intellectual and spiritual life of Christ's religion. Were they qualified so as not to open their teaching to setting aside and supplanting? Were they qualified for this? To this the answer is significant that Christ evidently intended just such qualification in his promise to the Apostles, at this last supper, of the Holy Spirit; for this Spirit was to come to them in the way of guaranteeing to them the full truth as to these historical initiatory events. Turn to the Master's valedictory remarks and it will be evident that the Spirit's instructive function, as far as the Apostles were concerned, was to make them Christ's representatives in the promulgation of Christianity in the world,¹ and that this instructive function was to be specifically the enlightening of the Apostles' mind as to the teachings which Christ himself had given them in the past.² This enlightening however was evidently to include the intervening historical events in reference to

¹ Jno. 15²⁶ f. (cf. 17¹⁸).

² 14²⁶.

which these teachings of Christ had been given; for Christ had reminded the Apostles that, while he had many things to say to them, to the receiving of which they were not yet equal, the Spirit whom he was to send would make up for this by guiding them into all the truth; and that this guiding of them was to be accomplished by the Spirit's taking of the things of Christ and showing them unto them, — the things with reference to which Christ's own teaching had heretofore been restricted.¹

The almost necessary assertion of our discussion then is the divine qualification of these Apostolic teachers for the interpreting of Christianity's initiatory events.² Behind this assertion we place, in their full confirmatory power, the facts which we have gained from

¹ 16¹²⁻¹⁴.

² If, as Forrest says, it was necessary for Christ's purpose that he should have "a special circle of selected spirits with whom he held constant relations, and on whom the totality of his self-revelation, his teaching, his miracles, his personal influence could be brought to bear," then it is not wholly unreasonable to suppose that, if this "totality of his self-revelation" was to be mediated to the world, this special circle should in some way be qualified to mediate it through their interpretation of the things which had manifested it to them. (The Christ of History, p. 129.)

our comparative study of the teachings of Jesus and of Paul. The agreement of these teachings, in the light of the historical facts around which they gather, gives a foundation for this assertion without which it would be impossible to make it, but with which the making of it gains a significance which it is impossible to deny.¹

Here are the conclusions therefore to which we seem to be driven. The evolutionary criticism of to-day is willing to admit the presence of historical facts in Christianity; but it insists that room must be left to say that the Christianity which reared itself upon their foundation can be accounted for on the supposition of natural processes of intellectual activity and spiritual enthusiasm; that the historical facts in Christianity have produced Christianity's religion in a way which makes Apostolic teaching merely a part of speculative

¹ There has been no intention in this discussion to in any way define inspiration. The purpose has been simply to show that the reasoning leads to the conclusion that the Apostles were intended to become, and in fact became, interpreters of Christianity, as others were not in their day, nor could be since.

theology, and reduces all Christ's authority to the sayings of Christ himself. In other words, it claims that the facts of Christianity have had such influence upon Apostolic thought, and this influence has been so thoroughly along the line of the Apostles' human individualism, that the results produced are of value only as personal opinions. The proof of all this has been the asserted unreconcilableness between the teachings of Jesus and those of his Apostles, chiefly Paul. Over against such a contention we have taken the only position we believe is possible. We have said: Allow the facts of Gospel history to have had their influence upon the Apostles' teaching; but ask whether they must not have had a restrictive influence upon Jesus's teaching, as well as a widening influence upon that of the Apostles. Admit the fact of disagreement between the teachings of Jesus and those of Paul; but ask whether this agreement is essential and beyond all hope of reconciliation. Examine the Apostles' teaching, in the light of these influencing historical facts, in the light of their pre-Christian environment and the experiences of

their Christian mission life, and let it say for itself whether it stands in fatal disadjustment with that of the Master's. If it does not, — if it shows itself to be naturally one with Christ's, then there is afforded an unanswerable critical basis for the assertion that it was the intention of Christ that the Apostles' theology should be guaranteed to us by the presence behind it and within it of the Holy Spirit of truth.

To-day's problem of the philosophy underlying New Testament criticism is thus an interesting one. It gives us new understanding of the relation of Jesus's teaching to that of his Apostles, who followed him. It confirms the fact that this Apostolic teaching was intended by Jesus to form an integral part of the fundamental teaching of his religion, and, in doing this, it shows us that the doctrine of Apostolic inspiration — special, particular, unique — is absolutely essential to the integrity of this religious fundamental teaching. There seems to be really no escape from it, if the Christianity of Christ himself is to hold any intelligible place in the thought and any controlling place in the life of man. Without

it Christ's teachings are the plaything of the Apostolic and every other age; with it Christ's teachings gather around the charter events of his religion in a way which makes that religion the one permanent, persistent, determining truth in the world.

VI

DEVELOPMENT OF PAUL'S DOCTRINE OF CHRISTIAN UNITY

IN the preceding lecture we dealt with what we chose to call the fundamental teaching of Christianity, — the teaching which gathered around the initiatory facts that constituted Christianity the religion that it is. This teaching, we tried to make clear, was historically dependent upon these facts, both as it was restricted in the teaching of Jesus and as it was widened in the teaching of the Apostles. More than this, we attempted to show that, in the case of the Apostles, this very teaching of theirs, which was so widened out by these initiatory facts, was further influenced by the after facts which came to them in their mission life; so that their interpretation of these beginning events of Christianity was broadened and deepened and clarified by all their mission experiences, — their struggles, their successes,

their defeats, — until, as we gather together all they teach us, we have what Christ himself intended should stand before us as the fundamental teaching of his religion. In this closing lecture we wish to deal with the class of teachings which may, in a relative sense of the word, be said to lie outside the fundamental teaching of Christianity. We wish to show that, however these also may have had their preliminary enunciation in the teachings of Jesus, they too have been largely dependent upon historical facts for the developed form which they came to have with the Apostles.

We are perfectly well aware that there is need of caution in this task. No one to-day is likely to question the fact of development in Apostolic theology to some degree at least. Such a thing is, in itself, too natural and, as a matter of fact, too well established to be held in doubt; but critics have pushed this idea of development so far, that they make bold to say, not only that Paul's theology grew during his mission work, but that its growth is clearly and distinctly marked by the difference in the Epistles through which it expressed

itself; so that the order of the Epistles is itself decided by the new and even contradictory ideas which they display, beginning with a crude and simple-minded Paulinism, and proceeding on to one that is not only fully developed, but complex and self-confused.¹

It is very clear that this is an extreme position. Paul's letters were not written in order to express the stages of his theological thought; so that his first Epistle must give all the theology he had to begin with, and his last Epistle all the theology he had to end with. These Epistles are not bulletins from a theological workshop. They are the natural efforts of the man to meet the emergencies of his mission, and it is these emergencies which give the Epistles the differences which they have among themselves. It is these emergencies which make them more or less intense, more or less new, sometimes seemingly even contradictory. The individuality of Paul's experience is to be taken into account, as well as the

¹ Cf. Clemen, *Chronologie*, S. 256-275. W. Mackintosh, *The Christian Religion*, pp. 433 f. See also Steck, *Der Galaterbrief*, S. 372-374.

individuality of Paul himself, when we talk about the evolution of his theology. We are not to say Paul had no idea of justification by faith until the Galatian controversy overtook him, and that this controversy must have overtaken him late in his work, because this idea is so intensely Pauline. Paul must have had the essential idea of justification by faith, in order to be himself converted on the Damascus road; and if his apprehension of this great truth was brought to intenser clearness by this trouble in his Galatian churches, there is no reason to believe this controversy must not have occurred where the history of the Book of Acts places it, — early in his ministry, rather than late. We are not to say Paul had no conception of the deity of Christ until the Gnostic heresy forced him, in self-defence, to postulate it; and that this heresy could only have come to him late, because the deity idea itself is so developed. Paul evidently believed in the essential deity of Christ from his first Epistles, however profoundly he may have come to apprehend it under pressure of this Asia Minor agitation. And if we say this agitation came

to him late in his mission, we say it, not so much because of the developed ideas which it involves, as because of the historically proved lateness of the letters in which it is opposed and controverted. In other words, there was a growth in Paul's theology, traces of which we can discover, as his Epistles pass before us; but there was also an integrity in Paul's theology, in virtue of which its essential outlines were present from the start; so that his Epistles place before us the individual developments which the emergencies of his work gave to the ideas he already had.

We recognize thus the caution that is necessary in dealing with this fact of development in Apostolic theology. There must be a constant appreciation of the fact, not only that there is a balance between the human and divine elements in the truth which came to the Apostles, but that, within the human elements, there is a balance between the constant and the progressive factors in the movement of the theology to its completion; so that Paul's Gospel did not grow out of nothing into something, but was essentially the same Gospel from the

start. At the same time, it was influenced by the personal experiences of his mission work; so that, as the years went on, it was broadened and deepened into an ever fuller and more out-rounded, but always self-consistent message of truth. This, we hold, a candid study of Paul's theology will make clear.

The purpose of this lecture therefore is, recognizing the presence of these constant and progressive forces, to show how the Apostolic theology was wrought upon by these personal experiences of mission work, until it was developed from its primal to its completed forms.

We do not, of course, intend to compass the whole theology, — not even that part of it which we have chosen to designate as lying outside the fundamental teaching of Christianity, and which we have now specifically before ourselves. This would be far beyond the limits of a lecture. We wish to take up but a single doctrine, — the doctrine of Christian unity, — and show how, in the providences of Paul's work, it was — we do not say suggested to him; for its essential idea is apparently with him from the beginning, and goes back

beyond him to the teachings of Jesus himself, — but how, by his mission experiences, it has been lifted up and widened out into the developed form in which he finally cast it. This is all we can give ourselves time to do; but we hope what is here shown may make clear the principle we propose, and indicate how it may be applied perhaps in other directions.

Paul's position, at the close of his mission work in the East, was one which had a decided effect upon his state of mind at that time and upon his plans for future work. This mission work had been successful. As far as geography was concerned, it had pushed the Gospel up to the borders of Illyricum;¹ as far as theology was concerned it had carried through the controversy with the Judaistic party in the Church. The geographical fact confirmed him in his purpose to go to Rome; the theological fact had an influence upon the way he went. It compelled him to go with a careful statement of his Gospel beforehand, — not because the Christians of Rome did not know his Gospel; for it is evident from his letter to them, that,

¹ Rom. 15¹⁹.

though he had never visited the Church, he was personally acquainted with many of its people;¹ while, from the way the Church must have organized itself in the absence of any Apostolic founding, evidently a large part of its congregation was made up of converts from his own Eastern mission fields.² It was not therefore to inform these Christians of his Gospel that he wrote to them, but to correct them as to their understanding of this Gospel which they knew.

To get clear before us the correction which he had in mind, let us remember that his success against the Judaistic agitators was a success which carried with itself the danger of reaction. We do not mean by this that the rescued churches were likely to go back to Judaism, after all; but that the Gentile element in these, and in other Pauline churches,

¹ Rom. 16 ch.

² Sanday may be allowed to be correct in his refusal to see, in Rom. 6¹⁷, any reference to a distinctive Pauline type of doctrine. The Apostle would have more likely referred to such a teaching of his own as "my Gospel" (16²⁵, 2¹⁶); but, at the same time, such a general interpretation of 6¹⁷ does not destroy the evidence for the Pauline character of the Roman Church gathered from other facts.

was likely to exaggerate and overdo Paul's principle of freedom from the law. It was a tendency perfectly natural in itself, as the tendency to abuse successful ideas always is, and one consequently which we might easily expect; so that we are not surprised to find, at a later date, evidences of antinomianism in the Philippian Church.¹ Indeed, even before the Roman Epistle was written, the Apostle's opponents, either within the Jewish element of the Eastern Churches, or among the unbelieving Jews outside the Church, were beginning to slander his Gospel and affirm that it taught the principle of doing evil that good might come.²

But if such a tendency was possible in the East, much more was it possible in the West, especially in such a church as that at Rome, in which the Gentile element was not only so much more prominent, but where it had naturally so much freer swing for its ideas, because of the Gentile atmosphere of the city round about it. Here antinomianism might come to a fixedness of creed and life, and a higher

¹ Phil. 3^{18f.}

² Rom. 3^{8.}

Pauline Gentilism, self-conscious of the conquest which its Gospel had accomplished in the East, might lord it over the rest of the Church.

To guard against such a danger as this Paul's letter to the Roman Church was written. It was written before the Apostle's departure for Rome, partly because of his habit, to prepare, in this way, for his coming among his Churches,¹ but mostly because the danger against which he wished to guard was already, to a certain degree, present among them.² This was, in fact, generally the reason why he prepared the Churches for his coming among them. We can see therefore how it was this trouble in the Roman Church which gave rise to this Roman letter; and we can see also how it was the character of this trouble which must have determined the form which the letter took.³

¹ See cases of I Cor. (16¹⁻¹¹); II. Cor (12¹⁴⁻²¹), 13^{1 f.}, and I Tim. (1²⁻⁴, 4¹³⁻¹⁶).

² Rom. 16^{17 f.}.

³ For a detailed discussion of this question, see article "Paul's Purpose in Writing Romans," *Presbyterian Quarterly*, Jan. 1893.

Let us see how it did so. On general principles we would say such a trouble as this was to be met in two ways : (1) As far as it consisted in an abuse of Paul's law-free Gospel, there must be shown the reality with which this Gospel recognized the law. (2) As far as this abuse led to a tendency of the Gentile element to lord it over the Jewish element, there must be shown the equality with which this Gospel recognized the Gentile and the Jew in the salvation plan. As a matter of fact however this is very much just what Paul has done in his Epistle. (1) He shows, not only that his Gospel is in accordance with the Old Testament economy, but that it recognized the law to be in itself holy and just and true, and laid emphasis on the fact that it continues its obligations of holiness upon the Christian life. (2) But, beyond this and specially, he shows that Gentile and Jew stand on the same Gospel basis before God, that they are under the same condemnation of sin, that they are privileged to the same condition of faith, and that they move under the same obligation to holiness in the new life; though the

Jewish people never lose their significant place in the promises of God, are still God's people, in spite of their present unbelief, and are, in God's time, to be brought to a full realization of this fact by their conversion to the faith which rests in Christ.

It is this idea of Gospel equality, and, at the same time, theocratic supremacy which gives the framework to his argument. He begins his Epistle by showing that Gospel righteousness is impossible through the efforts of either Gentile or Jew; because neither is able through good works to justify himself before God. This is a matter of history common to both. The pagan world showed it for the Gentile; the Hebrew world showed it for the Jew. He makes clear further that both Gentile and Jew have secured the Gospel righteousness on the same identical basis, — the basis of faith, since no other basis is possible on which it can be secured, — and so stand within the Christian life on equal footing. And if this raises questions among the Gentile element, as to how the present unbelieving and reprobate condition of the Jewish world is to

be accounted for, the answer is given by saying that the Jews are still God's chosen people, and if, by reason of unbelief, they be cast away, it is only for the present, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in, when all Israel shall be saved. The Gentiles therefore are not to boast themselves; for, after all, they are not the natural branches to this spiritual olive tree, but only grafted in. They are not to be highminded, but to fear. For if it is through unbelief that blindness, in part, has happened to Israel, it is only by faith that the Gentile is saved from the same fate; and if it is by grace that part of God's chosen Israel has been saved, it is much more by grace — if such a thing can be — that any of this outside pagan, God-unchosen world is saved.

This is the Apostle's argument. On its basis he proceeds to bring out the duties of practical Christian living, among which it is impossible not to see prominent the duty of mutual forbearance among members of the Church, especially the duty of forbearance on the part of those members who were conscious of freedom from ceremonial restrictions, over

against those whose consciences were not yet free from such burdens.¹

Now it is clearly impossible that this condition of affairs should not have had an influence upon Paul's idea of Christian unity. That he had had such an idea before this time there need, of course, be no question. It is quite evident in the Thessalonian Epistles, — his earliest writings, — where he is comforting the people in their persecutions. He exhorts them to be at peace among themselves,² and prays that the Lord may make them increase and abound in love one toward another, and toward all men.³ In fact, he says that, concerning love of the brethren, they had no need that one write to them; for they themselves were taught of God to love one another. But he writes them to abound more and more in this grace, and that they study to be quiet and to attend to their own business and to work with their own hands, even as he had charged them.⁴ It is an idea which he says these Thessalonians have as an essential part of their Christian

¹ Cf. chs. 14 & 15.

³ 3¹².

² I Th. 5¹³.

⁴ 4⁹⁻¹¹.

knowledge, and consequently which he himself must have had, and had from the beginning of his Christian work. At the same time however it is an idea which apparently does not go out beyond the problem of unity in the local church. What the Apostle evidently has in mind is simply the tendencies to shiftlessness and busyboding and personal discord among the members of the Church, all of which, he says, stand opposed to the fundamental Christian principle of brotherly love.

In the Roman Epistle however, while the local unity was doubtless first in his mind, the specific character which the local trouble had, seemed to throw his idea of unity out beyond the local church into the Church at large. It was not here the mere question of brotherly love among the members of the Church, it was the far larger question of charity of thought and harmony of life between the two great elements of Apostolic Christendom, — the Gentile and the Jew. His idea of unity seemed to be given a new significance by the new conditions in the Roman trouble. It apparently took a wider sweep from the fact

that the trouble with which it was concerned brought up a wider sweeping state of affairs.

See how this is made clear to us by the passages in this Epistle, where the unity idea is brought out: "But I speak to you that are Gentiles. Inasmuch, then, as I am an Apostle of Gentiles, I glorify my ministry: if by any means I may provoke to jealousy them that are my flesh, and may save some of them. For if the casting away of them is the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead? And if the first fruit is holy, so is the lump: and if the root is holy, so are the branches. But if some of the branches were broken off, and thou, being a wild olive, wast grafted in among them, and didst become partaker with them of the root of the fatness of the olive tree; glory not over the branches: but if thou gloriest, it is not thou that bearest the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt say, then, branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in. Well; by their unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by thy faith. Be not highminded, but fear: for if God spared not the natural branches, neither will

he spare thee. Behold, then, the goodness and severity of God: toward them that fell, severity; but toward thee, God's goodness, if thou continue in his goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off. And they also, if they continue not in their unbelief, shall be grafted in: for God is able to graft them in again. For if thou wast cut out of that which is by nature a wild olive tree, and wast grafted, contrary to nature, into a good olive tree: how much more shall these, which are the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree?"¹ "For I say, through the grace that was given me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but so to think as to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to each man a measure of faith. For even as we have many members in one body, and all the members have not the same office: so we, who are many, are one body in Christ, and severally members one of another."² "Let not him that eateth set at nought him that eateth not; and let not him that eateth not judge him that eateth: for God hath received

¹ I I 13-24.

² I 2 3-5.

him. . . . Thou, why dost thou judge thy brother? or thou again, why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of God. . . . Let us not, therefore, judge one another any more: but judge ye this rather, that no one put a stumblingblock in his brother's way, or an occasion of falling."¹ "We that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves."² It is very evident that here is a going out of the unity idea beyond the mere questions of the local Church. This trouble between the Gentile and the Jew was not a mere party trouble between two factions in the Roman Church; it touched the question generally of the strong against the weak; it affected the whole fact of the body of Christ; it swept out into the plan of God for the salvation of the world. It is something far more than a local problem which Paul has in mind; and so his idea of unity, which stands over against this problem, is something broader than it shows itself to be in the Thessalonian case.³

¹ 14^{8, 10, 13}.

² 15¹.

³ The local idea is not wanting, as is clear from 13^{8, 10, 13}, 15^{5 f.}, but beyond it stands this broader idea.

But it will doubtless be asked, why it is, if this is so, that we do not see evidences of this broader idea in the Corinthian and Galatian Epistles. In the Churches to which these letters were sent the trouble between Jew and Gentile had already occurred. If Paul's idea of church unity was to be widened out by difficulties which involved these two great elements in the Apostolic Church, the widening out was, or ought to be, present before the Roman Epistle was written.

This question is a perfectly legitimate one, and the answer to it is simply that such evidences of a widening out of Paul's unity idea, to a certain degree at least, are exactly what we do find in these Epistles. We cannot help but notice the difference between Thessalonians and Corinthians in this respect. Recall the Thessalonian passages: "Be at peace among yourselves." "The Lord make you to increase and abound in love one toward another." "We exhort you that ye study to be quiet and to do your own business, and to work with your own hands."¹ Now place over against them these

¹ I Th. 5¹³, 3¹², 4¹¹.

passages which we find in Corinthians and Galatians: "Now I beseech you, brethren, through the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfected together in the same mind and in the same judgment. . . . Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized into the name of Paul? . . . Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel. . . . We preach Christ crucified, unto Jews a stumblingblock, and unto Gentiles foolishness; but unto them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God."¹ "What then is Apollos? and what is Paul? Ministers through whom ye believed; and each as the Lord gave to him. . . . We are God's fellow-workers: ye are God's husbandry, God's building."² "Concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, I would not have you ignorant. . . . There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are diversities of ministrations, and the same Lord. And there are diversities of workings, but the same God, who worketh

¹ I Cor. I 10, 18, 17 a, 23 f.

² 3⁵, 9.

all things in all. . . . As the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink of one Spirit. For the body is not one member, but many. . . . Now ye are the body of Christ, and severally members thereof.”¹

“Concerning things sacrificed to idols: We know that we all have knowledge. Knowledge puffeth up, but love edifieth. . . . Howbeit in all men there is not that knowledge: but some, being used until now to the idol, eat as of a thing sacrificed to an idol; and their conscience being weak is defiled. But meat will not commend us to God: neither, if we eat not, are we the worse; nor, if we eat, are we the better. But take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumblingblock to the weak. For if a man see thee which hast knowledge sitting at meat in an idol’s temple, will not his conscience, if he is weak, be emboldened to eat things sacrificed to idols? For through thy

¹ 12 1, 4-6, 12-14, 27.

knowledge he that is weak perisheth, the brother for whose sake Christ died. And thus, sinning against the brethren, and wounding their conscience when it is weak, ye sin against Christ. Wherefore, if meat make my brother to stumble, I will eat no flesh for evermore, that I make not my brother to stumble."¹ "Give no occasion of stumbling, either to Jews or to Greeks, or to the church of God: even as I also please all men in all things, not seeking mine own profit, but the profit of the many, that they may be saved."² "Ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ. There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female: for ye are all one man in Christ Jesus."³

It is clearly evident that Paul's idea of Christian unity has undergone a change here from what we see of it in the Thessalonian Epistles, and that this change is very much in the direction of that which we have before us in the Roman letter. Here, as there, the

¹ 8 1, 7-18.

² 10⁸² f.

³ Gal. 3²⁶⁻²⁸.

local loses itself in the general idea. Here is the same widening out from the mere parties in the Church to the broad question of the strong against the weak, — to the great fact of the body of Christ, to the general idea of life and work within the Christian communion. And the unity idea widens with it.

And yet one cannot help but see also a decided difference between these passages and those in the Roman letter. These passages do not have behind them the same deep cleavage between Jew and Gentile as in the Roman Epistle. There, in the Corinthian passages, for instance, are parties, — parties indeed involving these two elements of the Church, — involving them at their characteristic points of adherence to, and freedom from the ceremonial law; but, after all, when you look closely at the trouble, it has not swung much beyond partisanship. It has not come to the same deep difficulty we find at Rome. It has not gone as far even as in Galatia. The trouble may indeed be said to be between Jew and Gentile; but it is not as developed, as among the Galatians, and with neither the Corinthians

nor Galatians has it come to the reverse trouble between Gentile and Jew, as at Rome. So it is clear that, while Paul's idea of unity in the Corinthian and Galatian case is widened out beyond the Thessalonian limits — widened out apparently as far as it is in the case at Rome, the similarity is, after all, only apparent. The lateral sweep is the same, but not the downward reach. There is lacking in Corinthians and in Galatians one profound element which is present in Romans, and this is the element of the world redemption plan.

Let us spread out before ourselves again, briefly, the Corinthian passages: "I beseech you, brethren, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you. . . . Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? . . . We preach Christ crucified, unto Jews a stumblingblock, and unto Gentiles foolishness; but unto them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God."⁵ "What then is Apollos? and what is Paul? Ministers through whom ye believed." "We are God's fellow-

⁵ I Cor. I 10, 13, 23 f.

workers.”¹ “There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit, — diversities of ministrations, and the same Lord, — diversities of workings, but the same God. . . . As the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ. For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free, and were all made to drink of one Spirit. For the body is not one member, but many. . . . Ye are the body of Christ, and severally members thereof.”² “Meat will not commend us to God: neither, if we eat not, are we the worse; nor, if we eat, are we the better. But take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling-block to the weak. . . . For through thy knowledge he that is weak perisheth, the brother for whose sake Christ died.”³ “Give no occasion of stumbling, either to Jews, or to Greeks, or to the church of God.”⁴ And this Galatian passage: “Ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus. There

¹ 3⁵, 9^a.

² 12⁴⁻⁶, 12-14, 27.

³ 8^{8 f.}, 11.

⁴ 10³².

can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female: for ye are all one man in Christ Jesus."¹ Now place over against these the Roman passages and see the difference: "I speak unto you that are Gentiles. . . . If the casting away of God's people is the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead? And if the first-fruit is holy, so is the lump: and if the root is holy, so are the branches. But if some of the branches were broken off, and thou, being a wild olive, wast grafted in among them, and didst become partaker with them of the root of the fatness of the olive tree; glory not over the branches: but if thou gloriest, it is not thou that bearest the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt say then, Branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in. Well; by their unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by thy faith. Be not highminded, but fear; for if God spared not the natural branches, neither will he spare thee. . . . And they also, if they continue not in their unbelief, shall be

¹ Gal. 3²⁶⁻²⁸.

grafted in: for God is able to graft them in again. . . . I would not have you ignorant of this mystery, lest ye be wise in your own conceits, that a hardening in part hath befallen Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in; and so all Israel shall be saved.”¹ Here is a passage of wonderful sweep, in whose light we turn back to the first chapters of the Epistle and see what the Apostle means by the prominence which he seems to give to the Jew. “I am not ashamed of the Gospel: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.”² “God will render to every man according to his works: to them that by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honor and incorruption, eternal life: but unto them that are factious, and obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness, shall be wrath and indignation, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that worketh evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Greek; but glory and honor and peace to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek: for there is

¹ *II* 13 a, 15-21, 23, 25.

² *I* 16.

no respect of persons with God.”¹ “We lay to the charge both of Jews and Greeks, that they are all under sin. . . . Where then is the glorying? It is excluded. By what manner of law? of works? Nay: but by a law of faith. We reckon, therefore, that a man is justified by faith apart from the works of the law. Or is God the God of Jews only? is he not the God of Gentiles also? Yea, of Gentiles also: if so be that God is one, and he shall justify the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through faith.”² Paul has thrown his thought here out beyond the idea of the Jew and the Gentile in the Church’s general membership to the idea of the Jew and the Gentile in God’s great redemption plan for the world. And so it comes that the passages in Romans, which seem so similar to those in Corinthians, are really of a larger measure; for we cannot but see that they are thrown upon a larger background and belong to larger surroundings. “I say, through the grace that was given me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think;

¹ 2⁶⁻¹¹.

² 3^{9b, 27-30}.

but so to think as to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to each man a measure of faith. For even as we have many members in one body, and all the members have not the same office: so we, who are many, are one body in Christ, and severally members one of another." ¹ "Let not him that eateth set at nought him that eateth not; and let not him that eateth not judge him that eateth: for God hath received him. . . . Why dost thou judge thy brother? or thou again, why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of God." ²

We think it must now be quite clear why we began by calling attention to the Apostle's idea of unity, as it was affected by the condition of affairs at Rome, rather than at Corinth, or in Galatia; because, while the trouble at Corinth and in Galatia was of the same general character with that at Rome, the trouble at Rome was a real advance upon the earlier one. It was not a mere question of Jew and Gentile partisanship, as in Corinth, with the Gentiles so in prominence that the Apostle had to address

¹ 12 8-5.

² 14 8, 10.

himself specially to them and warn them against letting their knowledge override the scruples of the rest.¹ It was not the deeper question of a Jewish absorption of Gentilism, as in Galatia, with the Gentile so upheld in his freedom from the law by the Apostle that he had to be careful of the effect of his own argument and caution them against using their freedom for an occasion to the flesh.² It was the still more profound question of the Gentile despising the Jew in the salvation plan and his ignoring of the whole relation of Judaism to the Gospel purpose of God. It was the general trouble between Jew and Gentile come, for the first time, to a fundamental schism of the Church; and so, over against it, the essential need of unity come vitally to the front, with an outreaching sweep of significance and with an urging insistence of emphasis it had not had before.

To be sure, some will claim that Paul's conception of church unity was as broad as Christendom from the beginning, and that the reason why we do not see the same breadth of treat-

¹ I Cor. 8 ch.

² Gal. 5¹⁸.

ment in the Thessalonian, as in the Roman or in the Corinthian and Galatian cases, is because the Thessalonian case did not call for it. They say that Paul, having been converted as he was, with the idea of justification by faith so prominent in his experience, must have seen, from the beginning, what effect such a Gospel would have upon the Jewish and Gentile world outside the Church, and what trouble it would create between these elements within the Church's membership. We do not wish to deny prophetic insight to the Apostle, nor hold it impossible that, through divine revelation, he could receive his Gospel in full and complete before he entered upon his work; but we do say that neither of these things is likely, because this is not God's natural way of working with men, even though they be Apostles. Men grow in their views by their experience; and, while Paul doubtless had the general idea of Christian brotherhood from the beginning, this idea could not but have been broadened and deepened by the experiences of his work, — especially by such experiences as this schism between the two great component

elements in the Church. And this likelihood is confirmed by the change which is evident in the spirit of these Epistles' passages as we have cited them above.

It would seem therefore that this Jewish-Gentile trouble influenced Paul's idea of unity in very decided ways. As far as the trouble showed itself in factional antagonisms, it apparently widened the idea to a statement of the fellowship in work of servants of Christ and the essential unity of his body. As far as it led the strong to impose their knowledge upon the consciences of the weak, it apparently brought the idea to a statement of the responsibility which love owed to the communion of this body. As far as it worked out in the Judaistic propaganda of salvation by works, it apparently lifted the idea to a statement of the universality of the condition of faith and the essential unity of sonship in Jesus Christ. As far as it induced the Gentiles to abuse the freedom of the faith Gospel against the Jew, it apparently broadened and deepened the idea to a statement of the covenant prominence of the Jew in the salvation plan and the consequent

duty of fraternity which was owed by the Gentile in the Church.

Were this then the only trouble which influenced this idea, the fact itself of the influence and the results which the influence produced would be important for our understanding of Paul's theology; but, as we study the Apostle's life, it is quite clear to us that there was another trouble in his mission work which influenced it still further.

Let us recall the Apostle's experience after his writing of this Epistle to Rome: He leaves Corinth in the spring of the year, and after a voyage along the Asian coast, in which the shadows of portending evil gathered round him, came to Jerusalem. There he was set upon by the bigoted mob; rescued by the Roman power; sent a prisoner to Cæsarea; heard by the Governor, in the matter of the accusation brought against him; appealed to Cæsar's court; sailed for Rome, where he arrived, after an eventful voyage, only to find, as it seems to us the first chapter of Philippians makes quite clear, the hyper-Gentilism which he had written against in his Epistle still active in the

Church's life. He is patient with it, though it grieves him sorely, and apparently overcomes it, making the influence of the truth finally felt among them for a brotherhood of life and work. But while the Gospel was thus prospering in the West, there was in the East a trouble, whose coming the Apostle possibly referred to in his farewell speech to the Ephesian elders at Miletus. It was distinctively a trouble of thought, — an error of belief. It belonged to Asia Minor, as the meeting place of Eastern and Western thinking, and was characterized, as far as any characteristics are able to be gathered from it, by that theosophic angel-cult, that ascetic effort after perfection, and that proud exclusiveness which marked the eclecticism of the time that flourished most in the intellectual cosmopolitanism of Alexandria, but found a genial soil wherever Jewish thought and pagan philosophy and oriental mysticism came together, and must have realized in the Christian concepts and ideas simply the forms in which its fermentation could bring itself to perfection. In fact it was, unless we are very much mistaken in the study of it, the

first vague shadowy beginning of the Gnostic system, which came to its perfection in the following century.¹

The chief offence of Gnosticism however, in its later development and in this its first beginning, was its dishonoring of Jesus Christ. It professed to be very jealous for the honor of God, and so, for the sake of saving him from contact with evil matter, assumed a series of emanations, each one a little less divine than its predecessor, until one was found far enough below God to create the world without involving deity. At the head of this series it placed Jesus Christ, the most divine of all, and yet, like all, a created and not an uncreated being; more than man, — yes, at the head of this angel line, — but less than God, lowered from the throne and apart from the life, which were his own right and were the last necessity of sinful man. Over against this trouble the Apostle writes his Colossian letter, and he writes it straight at the trouble's great offending point, — the dishonoring of Jesus Christ. His argument is perhaps not altogether easy to

¹ Cf. note 1, p. 118.

follow, when one compares it with the carefully thought-out scheme of Romans; but there is no misunderstanding what it meant to declare, nor the one central point around which its reasoning moves. The Apostle seems to have one great thought in this Epistle, and this is the absolute supremacy of Jesus Christ, — his supremacy as creator of the world, as head of the Church, as the ultimate gathering point of the universe, — because of whose supreme sufficiency in their salvation they had no need of these teachers who were striving to lead them astray. This is the Apostle's master thought, — the absolute supremacy of Jesus Christ. It makes the Colossian letter the climax of his Christology.

Along with this Colossian letter however there was written another letter, of a somewhat similar and yet decidedly different kind, — the so-called Ephesian letter. It was written, not to this Church alone, but, through this Church as their mother, to the surrounding Churches, some hint of whose range is given us in the Apocalypse. In short, it was an encyclical letter.

But why should the Apostle write such a letter? Why should he follow such a letter as Colossians with another letter of such a kind as Ephesians? The natural answer to this question would, of course, be that, while there might be a specific difficulty at Colossæ needing a specific treatment, such as the Colossian letter gives, there might also be, in the same general region, a somewhat general condition of affairs, which would be best handled in just such a general pastoral way as an encyclical letter would provide.

Now what was this general condition of affairs likely to be? Let us remember. If we were right in saying the victory of Paul's law-free Gospel was likely to be followed by an exaggeration and abuse of the freedom; that such an exaggeration and abuse had, most likely, already shown itself in the East, before Paul wrote his Roman letter, and that it was largely present in the West, when he wrote it; if we were right in saying that this hyper-Paulinism was accompanied, in the West, with a depreciating attitude towards the Jewish element in the Church, and toward the entire

relation of Judaism to the Gospel dispensation, — then it would not be over-rash to infer that this unfriendliness toward the Jew, or at least this self-appreciation of the Gentile, might have manifested itself also in the East, and that this schism, which was such a thoroughly natural one in the peculiar dualistic constitution of Apostolic Christendom, would be likely to be found wherever Christianity had dualistically established itself.

But were this the state of affairs, in this seacoast province of Asia, and were the Apostle to write to the Churches of this province a pastoral letter, we should expect this letter to show some evidence of the trouble itself, and, over against the trouble, some traces of the Apostle's plea for Christian unity. We turn to Ephesians and we find just what we thus expected, only in a form which makes clear to us two things: (1) that the trouble in this Asian region was not so acute as it was in Rome; (2) that some new influence had been at work upon the Apostle's unity idea. The modification in the trouble we can readily understand.

The atmosphere, even at Ephesus itself, was not so absolutely Gentile as that of Rome. Gentilism in the Church would consequently not be so aggressive in this Eastern region as in and around the Western capital. This Gentile trouble with the Jew would therefore not be so acute.

But what was the new influence upon the Apostle's ideas, and whence did it come? Let us place the Ephesian letter before us and see if it will give us light. The Epistle begins in a peculiar way, — that is, compared with Paul's other letters, — though in a most natural way for an encyclical Epistle. It begins with an extended doxology in praise of the spiritual blessings of the plan of salvation, placing at the forefront of these blessings the fact of election, and carrying them up to their consummation in the universal headship of Christ, securing them at the same time, from beginning to end, to all of God's believing people, — first historically to the Jew, and afterward, though equally, to the Gentile.¹ It is a perfectly general passage, and suits well the gen-

¹ I 8-14.

eral character of the Epistle which it opens. It is followed by one of the Apostle's characteristic prayers that God would apply these blessings of salvation to the Epistle's readers, by giving them a progress in spiritual knowledge and life.¹ This prayer he closes with a fuller statement of the exalted headship of Christ, in which statement Christ's resurrection and exaltation are given as an illustration of the power which God is exerting toward us in spiritual things, especially in bringing us out of our spiritual death and placing us with Christ in our spiritual life.²

With this he comes to the Epistle's theme. It is in the latter half of the second chapter. It takes all this previous statement of God's gracious spiritual work with us as its background, and upon this background it brings out before the largely Gentile readers of the Epistle the vivid fact of their former untheocratic condition. "Wherefore, remember, that aforetime ye, the Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called Circumcision, in the flesh, made by hands;

1 1 16-19 a.

2 1 19 b-2 10.

that ye were at that time separate from Christ, alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of the promise, having no hope and without God in the world.”¹ But this condition of affairs, the Apostle reminds them, had been done away with for them by the work of Christ, in virtue of which all barriers had been broken down, and they, outcasts though they were, had been brought into an ideal theocratic position with the believing Israel of God. “But now in Christ Jesus ye [Gentiles] that were once afar off are made nigh in the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who made both [Gentile and Jew] one, and broke down the middle wall of partition [which separated them], having abolished in his flesh the enmity [between them], even the law of commandments expressing itself in ordinances; in order that he might create in himself of the twain [Gentile and Jew] one new [spiritual] man, so making peace; and in order that he might reconcile them both [Gentile and Jew] ideally in one body [of the Church] unto God through the cross, having slain the

enmity thereby; and he came and preached peace to you [Gentiles] that were far off, and peace to them [the Jews] that were nigh: for through him we both [Gentile and Jew] have our access in one Spirit unto the Father.”¹ It is thus clear that there could be but one thing for these Gentile readers of the Epistle to strive for, — the one great idea the Apostle had before him as the Epistle’s theme; the one great ideal these salvation-blessed Gentiles should ever have within their heart, — the complete unity in Jesus Christ of the membership of the Church. “So then ye [Gentiles] are no more [theocratic] strangers and sojourners, but ye are fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, being built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner stone; in whom each [personal character] building, fitly framed together [in its own spiritual development], groweth into a [general] holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye [Gentiles] also are builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit.”²

¹ vs. 18-18.

² vs. 19-22.

This then is the theme. Following it, the Apostle again comes to a prayer for his people, — a prayer unto the Father, from whom every family in heaven and on earth is named, to the end that they might be strong to know, with all the saints, the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, so that they might be filled with all the fulness of God.¹ In connection with this prayer he shows his Apostolic commission to his Gospel work, which was to declare the mystery hid through all the ages, but now proclaimed abroad, “that the Gentiles are fellow-heirs, and fellow-members of the body, and fellow-partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus through the Gospel.”² And then comes his practical exhortation, which is essentially this unity idea thrown into their every-day faith and living. “I therefore, the prisoner in the Lord, beseech you to walk worthily of the calling wherewith ye were called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long suffering, forbearing one another in love; giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body, and one Spirit,

¹ 3 1, 14-19.

² vs. 2-6.

even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all."¹ A unity which indeed has its diversities of gifts and ministries, but is destined to that ultimate unity of the faith which makes it possible "that we may be no longer children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, in craftiness, after the wiles of error; but speaking truth in love, may grow up in all things into him, which is the head, even Christ; from whom all the body fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, according to the working in due measure of each several part, maketh the increase of the body unto the building up of itself in love."² In such unity the Epistle's readers were to be followers of God, as dear children, and to walk in love toward each other, after the example of Christ's great love toward them.

It is beyond question that here is not simply Paul's unity idea again before us, but this idea

¹ 4¹⁻⁶.

² vs. 7-16.

essentially at the same angle as we saw it in the Epistle to Rome. It is the Gentiles to whom he is speaking. He is reminding them of what aliens and outcasts they were, and how it has only been through God's great and gracious love to them in Jesus Christ that they have been brought into their present blessed condition; so that, if they have any responsibility upon them, it is the responsibility of unstinted brotherhood with the rest of the Church, even though they be Jews; for, though the Jews had been saved by faith, just as the Gentiles had, the Jews had been what the Gentiles had not been, — God's theocratic people from the start. It is the same plea essentially as in Romans; for it is essentially the same trouble as it had been there.

At the same time however we cannot help but see that, with all this similarity, there is a difference between Paul's idea in Romans and Paul's idea here. The difference lies in the advance in the idea, — an advance in the magnificence of its proportions, and consequently in the profoundness of its character. The

Epistle's theme is, not simply the unity of the Church, but the unity of the Church in Jesus Christ supreme. This Paul had not preached before. He had, in a certain way, spoken of Christ as supreme. (1) As being, for example, the one theme of his Gospel message: "I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified."¹ (2) Or, as being the one foundation for his own and every one's Gospel work: "For other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ."² (3) Or, as being the one conditioning motive of the Christian's daily conduct, — his whole living, even his death: "For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; or whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live, therefore, or die, we are the Lord's."³ (4) Indeed, as being essentially supreme, very much as in Ephesians: "To us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we unto him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things and we through him."⁴ He had also, in a certain

¹ I Cor. 2².² 3¹¹.³ Rom. 14⁸.⁴ I Cor. 8⁶.

way, spoken of Christians as one in Christ: (1) As finding in Christ, along with the Spirit and the Father, the unity which controls the diversity of the Church's life, which again reminds us somewhat of Ephesians: "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are diversities of ministrations, and the same Lord. And there are diversities of workings, but the same God, who worketh all things in all."¹ (2) And, more specifically, as finding the dissensions existing among themselves removed, in the fact of the essential unity of all Christians in Christ: "For I say, through the grace that was given me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but so to think as to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to each man a measure of faith. For even as we have many members in one body, and all the members have not the same office: so we, who are many, are one body in Christ, and severally members one of another."² "Ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ

¹ 12⁴ 6.² Rom. 12³⁻⁵.

Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ. There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female: for ye are all one man in Christ Jesus."¹

But while this is all so, these two lines not only fail to go out as far as Ephesians carries them; but they fail to come together in one thought, as Ephesians so characteristically brings them. Here, in Ephesians, it is not simply Jesus Christ as supreme, — even essentially so, — nor simply the Jewish Gentile, nor even the Gentile Jewish dissensions, as finding their unifying point in him. It is the ideal Christian theocracy having its communal unity of life in Christ, as its supreme head, — head over all things, — the world, — the whole universe of being, — over everything that would dethrone him from his sovereign Godhead in thought and life. Let such a supremacy be once recognized in these Asian churches and all trace of faction and schism will be forever done away; for there can be nothing but

¹ Gal. 3²⁶⁻²⁸.

the completest communion among Christians, when Christians, in common, have Christ supreme.

But it is evident now what it is that has influenced the Apostle's unity idea to this advanced position. It is simply the Christological trouble in Colossæ, which doubtless was more or less present throughout all that adjoining region of the Asian province. This it is that has brought the Apostle to assert this climax thought in his doctrine of Christian unity. Through this trouble his unity idea has grown beyond what it was in his letter to the Roman Church. Through this trouble it has come to its climax. It would seem therefore very clear that, essentially as Paul must have had the idea of Christian brotherhood and unity from the beginning, truly as he must have gotten it from Christ's own thought, — "that they may be one, even as we are one,"¹ — that it was nevertheless through the pressure of these troublous experiences in his mission work that it was lifted up to these heights and swept out to the breadths which we see

¹ Jno. 17²² b.

specifically in his Roman and in his Ephesian letters.

This course of lectures has tried to place you in contact with one of the important problems of to-day's New Testament thinking. It has attempted, in a prefatory way, to impress you with the need of right method in your work, and it has tried to show you what this right method was. It has made effort to let you into the secret of the philosophy influence upon the criticism of to-day, and it has tried to show you that there were facts in the Apostolic life and thought which make it quite impossible to deny the presence of an environment influence upon it, and a development principle in it. It has made bold to bring you face to face with the application of this philosophy to the significant question of the relation between the teachings of Jesus and the Apostles, and it has tried to show that, granting environment and development their rightful and unquestioned place and influence in this relation, it is a place and influence which makes no difference between Jesus and his Apostles that

cannot be accounted for by the very principles of historical evolution, which to-day's philosophy maintains, — that, in fact, these principles of historical progress in the beginning events of Christianity throw light upon much which may have puzzled us in this difference between Jesus and his Apostles, and show us that Christ intended not simply that his work should be carried on, but that his teaching should be filled out by those whom he had chosen for this purpose, and to whom he had promised an endowment of spiritual guidance which would enable them to complete his plan. We have tried to be true to our method and to take no position which was not given us by a critical induction of facts. That we have come short of our ideal we know only too well. If we have, in any way, pointed you to an ideal which you might fix now for your own investigation and study, we shall be only too grateful to the Master who has helped us in what we have done, — especially if what we have said has made clear to you, as we feel it has made clear to us, that this religion of the Christ stands to-day, when honestly studied and searched, the most natu-

ral, and at the same time the most supernatural thing in the world, that it proves itself to-day, more than it ever did before, as coming to us through human media, and yet as resting ultimately in its source and in its authority, on that which is specifically and absolutely divine.

Index

- ACTS, problem of, 10.
Apocalypse, problem of, 7.
Apostles, circle of, 14; inspiration of, 13, 133, 228; qualifications as teachers, 223; relation to Jesus Christ, 15, 222; understanding of Christ's teaching, 216; value of teaching, 226.
- BAUR, N. T. criticism of, 85.
Beyschlag, view of Christ's relationship to God, 193.
Blass, work on Acts, 11.
- CLEMEN, Documentation of the Epistles, 42.
Clement of Alexandria, evidence for II. Thessalonians, 61.
- DAVIDSON, N. T. Introduction, 37.
Dods, N. T. Introduction, 37.
- EICHHORN, N. T. Introduction, 44.
- FEINE, documentation of Acts, 42.
Fichte, philosophy of, 82.
Fourth Gospel, problem of, 6.
- GODET, N. T. Introduction, 36, 45, 46.
- HARNACK, opinion of II. Peter, 9; origin of Christianity, 22.
Hebrews, authenticity of, 70; problem of, 10.
Hegel, philosophy of, 82, 85.
Holtzmann, N. T. Introduction, 36, 45, 46.
Holy Spirit, relation to the new life of the believer, 178.
Horne, Introduction to the Bible, 31.
Hug, N. T. Introduction, 44.
Hume, philosophy of, 92.

- INTRODUCTION, General, proper method of, 33, 51; Special, proper method of, 38, 54.
- JESUS CHRIST, doctrine of the condition of Salvation, 164, 172; doctrine of the Person of Christ, 189, 191, 193, 196, 207; doctrine of the relation of man to God, 141, 150; doctrine of the relation of the Holy Spirit to the new life of the believer, 178, 180, 183; originator of Christianity, 130; Paul's teaching of the supremacy of, 265, 274; Person of, 178; relation to the Apostles, 15; teachings of, 17, 18, 20, 24, 25; relation to Paul's theology, 126.
- John, theology of, 95.
- Jülicher, N. T. Introduction, 36, 45, 47.
- Jüngst, documentation of Acts, 42.
- Justin Martyr, evidence for II. Thessalonians, 61.
- KANT, philosophy of, 82, 90.
- LEIBNITZ, philosophy of, 81.
- Logia, papyrus of Oxyrrhyncus, 65.
- Luke, prologue to Gospel, 5.
- MATTHIAS, choice of, 14.
- Michaelis, N. T. Introduction, 44.
- NEANDER, N. T. writings, 82.
- New Testament Canon, 12.
- ORIGEN, evidence for II. Thessalonians, 61.
- PAPIAS, testimony of, 40.
- Pastoral Epistles, authenticity of, 69.
- Paul, Antichrist passage in II. Thessalonians, 8; authority of, 19, 20; doctrine of justification by faith, 107; doctrine of the condition of Salvation, 166, 174; doctrine of the Person of Christ, 189, 192, 194, 204, 209; doctrine of the relation of man to God, 146, 150; doctrine of the relation of the Holy Spirit to the new life of the believer, 179, 181; Epistles, development of thought in, 113, 128, 219; problem of, 11; four chief Epistles of, 8; inspiration of, 13, 138; overestimate of, 130; position at close of mission work in the East, 236; reason for writing Romans, 236, 239; revelation to, 220; teachings of, 24, 25; theology of, 23, 24, 95; de-

- velopment of, 231; how obtained, 123; relation to the teachings of Jesus, 126; training of, 135.
- Peter, change of position on Gentile salvation, 163; preaching in Jerusalem, 108; theology of, 95.
- Peter II., problem of, 9.
- Pfleiderer, theology of Paul, 23.
- Philosophy, problem of, 73.
- Polycarp, evidence for II. Thessalonians, 61.
- RAMSAY, work on Acts, 11.
- Ritschl, theology of, 86.
- SABATIER, theology of, 23.
- Salmon, N. T. Introduction, 37, 48.
- Schleiermacher, philosophy of, 82.
- Semler, N. T. Introduction, 44; philosophy of, 81.
- Simon, N. T. Introduction, 44.
- Sorof, documentation of Acts, 42.
- Spitta, documentation of Acts, 42.
- Steck, N. T. criticism, 41.
- Synoptic problem, 5.
- THEOPHILUS, 109.
- Tholuck, N. T. writings, 83.
- Tolstoi, The Gospel in Brief, 17.
- Tübingenism, 41, 85, 98, 102.
- VAN MANEN, documentation of Acts, 42.
- Völter, N. T. criticism, 41.
- WATSON, The Mind of the Master, 17; view of Christ's death, 161.
- Weiss, N. T. Introduction, 36, 45, 47.
- Weisse, documentary theory of the Synoptics, 98.
- Wendt, Die Lehre des Paulus, 20; Die Lehre Jesu, 19; Die Norm des echten Christentums, 19; theology of Paul, 24.
- ZAHN, N. T. Introduction, 36, 48.

